FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 028 11 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Reiterates Stand on SDI Testing AA 1
Shultz Attempts To Justify SDI Criticized AA 1
[Kornilov]
Chernyshev Outlines Threat Posed by SDI AA 2
Arbatov Sees Chance for 'Normalization' of Relations AA 3
[Budapest]
Polish Envoy's Remarks at Stockholm Conference Cited AA 6
Soviet, U.S. Delegates Complete Round of Talks AA 6

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

DPA Reports East-West 'Agent' Exchange 11 Feb CC 1
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 2
[Gerasimov, Volskiy, Sobolev]
'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 10
[Pravdin, Krasikov, Mikhaylov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reports on Challenger Explosion, Investigation A 1
Commission Demands Documents A 1
[Legantsov]
Next Three Launches Postponed A 1
Engineer Reflects on Disaster A 1
[Markov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Feb]
Kennedy Press Conference in U.S. Reported A 4
[PRAVDA 10 Feb]
Latin American Foreign Ministers Arrive in U.S. A 5
U.S. Naval Maneuvers Off Libyan Coast Reported A 5
'Permanent Pressure' Desired A 5
'Provocative' Maneuvers Expected A 5
Reagan Radio Address Confirms Domestic Cuts A 6
[Dunayev]
Increased Military Spending in U.S. Discussed A 6
[Zholkver]
Joint Chiefs Urge Support for 'Global Role' A 8
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Feb]

CHINA

New Firm To Handle Border Trade With PRC B 1
[Chetvergov in TRUD 8 Feb]
Paper Notes PRC Military Commission Meeting B 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Feb]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Criticism of 'Team Spirit-86' Exercises Reported C 1
Rehearsal for Nuclear War C 1
Undermines Asian, Pacific Security C 1
[Korolev]
U.S. Intimidation Displayed C 2
[Agayants]
DPRK Condemns Exercises C 3

SOUTH ASIA

Arkhipov Receives DRA Mines, Industry Minister D 1
[PRAVDA 7 Feb]
Afghan PDPA Secretary Praises Soviet Support D 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]
Foreign Journalists Briefed During Afghan Visit D 2
[PRAVDA 7 Feb]

EASTERN EUROPE

Yeltsin Receives PZPR Delegation in Moscow F 1
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Feb]
IZVESTIYA Reports Soviet-Polish Consultations F 1
[9 Feb]
Albanian Trade Accords With Poland, CSSR Cited F 1
[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]

WESTERN EUROPE

Soviet Ambassador to Spain Leaves Post G 1
[AFP]
Zamyatin Visits Finland. Meets With Officials G 1
Received by Foreign Minister G 1
Prime Minister Meets Zamyatin G 1
KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on Gorbachev Interview G 1
Interviewer Comments [9 Feb] G 1
'Anti-Sovietism' in France [Privalov, 9 Feb] G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S., Israel Preparing Operation Against Libya H 1
[Rassadin]
Syrian-Soviet Talks Held on Advanced Missiles [KUNA] H 1
Syrian CP Issues Pre-Election Statement H 1
[PRAVDA 10 Feb]
Zamyatin Discusses Mideast Developments [AFP] H 2
'Arafat Meets Soviet Ambassador in Amman H 2
[Amman AL-DUSTUR 7 Feb]
Soviet Envoy to Jordan Also Given Oman Post H 2
[PRAVDA 9 Feb]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Staffers Hit U.S. Support for UNITA J 1
[Pilyatskin, Palladin, Nikonov, 1 Feb]

Parliamentary Delegation Visits Sierra Leone J 3
Mukashev Attends Parade J 3
[PRAVDA 26 Jan]
Visit Ends J 3
[PRAVDA 30 Jan]

REAGAN REITERATES STAND ON SDI TESTING

LD102346 Moscow TASS in English 2338 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 10 TASS -- The U.S. President has stated that the U.S. should help forward the research and tests within the framework of the "star wars" program. He met in the White House with a group of journalists.

Observers point out that it is for the second time in past several days that the head of the U.S. Administration makes a statement reiterating point-blank the intention of the U.S. not to confine itself only to the research within the framework of the "star wars" program, but also to test the component parts of that system.

SHULTZ ATTEMPTS TO JUSTIFY SDI CRITICIZED

LD101651 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Feb 86

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Feb (TASS) -- The more resolute the protests of world public opinion, including U.S., against the militarist "star wars" plans worked out in the United States, the more actively and cunningly do they try in Washington to justify these dangerous schemes. The latest such attempt was made in an interview given to THE NEW YORK TIMES by G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state. Praising SDI, he declared that it is the President's dream, allegedly, "to reach a stage when we could liquidate nuclear weapons altogether" and even asserted that this "dream" has played its part and had an effect.

I will not go into what Mr Shultz calls "the President's dream" -- perhaps Mr Reagan really does believe in the "salvation" mission of "star wars." However, the fact remains that if anyone in Washington does believe this, then for every believer in Washington -- and this is clearly confirmed in many statements by spokesmen of the Republican administration and by the U.S. press itself -- there are at least 10 cynics who have something in mind that is not at all like that which Mr Shultz interprets on behalf of the President. Some, understanding that an "impenetrable shield" cannot be created, are ready to settle for a smaller, limited antimissile defense which, in combination with preventive [uprezhdayushchiy] strike against other side's forces of vengeance, would create the opportunity for unpunished nuclear aggression. Others simply want to make money: Let us recall that the combined profits of 10 leading U.S. military-industrial corporations have increased 150 percent in the past 5 years and the Pentagon is now calling for an increase in funds for producing "ultramodern" armaments by a further 75 percent. Others are making foolish calculations that by drawing the Soviet Union into an arms race in space, its economy can be undermined. Others would like to increase the technical lead of the United States over Western Europe and thus keep it dependent...

The following question then arises: If the whole point is really to put an end to the nuclear threat, is it worth taking the "faith" of a handful of "enthusiasts" as a guiding star? Why should the United States not agree in principle with the latest Soviet proposals: They provide a very much shorter, more direct, cheaper, and, most important, safer way of eliminating the nuclear threat -- the total liquidation of nuclear weapons?

Trying to justify the current concept in Washington about guaranteeing security by means of a "superweapon" in space, Mr Shultz states further: "SDI is one of the chief reasons why the Russians are putting forward arms reduction proposals...SDI is not so much a problem, rather it is an asset to us."

In other words it is a matter of instilling in the minds of the gullible that the U.S. "big stick in space" is not a threat to peace, but something like a lever enabling Washington to almost put pressure on Moscow, inducing it to hold talks.

Nothing could be further from the truth! We should recall in this connection that from the very moment when the plans for "star wars" preparations were made public in the United States, the Soviet Union not only repeatedly pointed out the extreme danger of those plans, but stressed most definitely and with utter clarity that if Washington does not abandon its hopeless attempts to acquire military superiority by transferring the arms race into space, the Soviet Union will be forced to answer in a corresponding fashion to those attempts. And it would be a rapid and less expensive answer than the U.S. program, an answer which would completely neutralize the electronic space "star wars" machine being created by the Americans. Would the Americans really feel more comfortable if Soviet weaponry were also added to the echelons of space weapons that are being planned by Washington?

However, it is appropriate to repeat this again and again, such a turn of events, if it were to happen, would be counter to the intentions of the Soviet Union. Our political choice is not to step up the material preparations for war by spiralling the arms race on earth and in space, but by force of argument, by force of example, and by force of common sense to do everything possible to alter the dangerous course of international affairs. It is precisely this that the package of new, broad-scale Soviet initiatives is aimed: The Soviet Union proceeds from the point that although the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States, between East and West are enormous, the mutual links and interdependence that we have between us are just as great and the acuteness of the current moment does not leave the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, or the peoples of both countries, any other alternative than to grasp the great science of living together.

In a word, from whatever angle you approach it, Mr Shultz just cannot make both ends meet, when, attempting to depict black as white, he advertises SDI as somehow being to Washington's political "credit." This program -- the implementation of which, incidentally, would cost the U.S. taxpayer at least $2 trillion -- is, using the terminology of the U.S. secretary of state, not to Washington's "credit," but an obvious debit, for the accelerated preparations for the militarization of space which are continuing in the United States demonstrate again and again to the whole world that the U.S. ruling circles do not wish to give up strong-arm methods in politics and attempts to gain military superiority at any price, while their assurances that they desire a fruitful dialogue and arms control remain, up until now at any rate, nothing more than rhetoric, which is not backed up by practical deeds...

Thus, the question arises: What would those in the United States like to work toward, those who, not wishing to look at the international realities in a new way, from a stance of common sense and realism continue to stake on a nuclear-space fist? Waving such a fist has thus far led to nothing apart from a most dangerous stepping up of international tension and an increase in the threat to the security of all countries, including the United States. And one could expect nothing else from the militaristic line of preparing for "star wars," however hard Mr Shultz tries to prove the opposite...

CHERNYSHEV OUTLINES THREAT POSTED BY SDI

LD101858 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 10 TASS -- Vladmiri Chernyshev, TASS military news analyst, writes: The Soviet Union is deeply convinced that the "star wars" program increases the threat of war, and can make it probable at a certain stage.

This is the evaluation given by Mikhail Gorbachev in his answers to the questions of the newspaper L'HUMANITE.

This danger increases because of a number of factors. First as a result of the widespread illusions of its own invulnerability and that it is possible to launch the first nuclear strike from beyond a space "shield" and to prevent or, at least, weaken a counterstrike down to an "acceptable level," a notion, which is a product of wishful thinking.

Second, in connection with the changes in the material basis of the military potential of the sides and the disappearance in this connection of the very notion of strategic stability, the turning of the present-day strategic balance into a strategic chaos.

And, third, as a result of an error or disrepair of highly sophisticated computer systems.

As a result of the deployment of space strike weapons a situation would emerge when decisions of fundamental significance and irreversible in their consequences would be taken, as a matter of fact, by electronic computers without participation of human intellect, political will, without taking into account the criteria of morality and ethics. In such a situation mankind would become hostage of machines and, consequently, of disrepair in them or of their malfunctioning. It is impossible to foretell all circumstances, which such a "star wars" system could encounter in reality, but it can be tried and checked only in the conditions, in which it is designed to function, i.e. in the conditions of war. Even the slightest failure of the system will lead to nuclear war and there will be no "going back" to repair the faulty equipment and analyze the situation.

Apart from the errors of computers themselves, war can break out simply because of solar activity blinding all pick-ups or because of false effects simulated by the northern lights. A satellite falling to pieces can be mistaken by a pick-up for an approaching nuclear warhead, and fire on a gas pipeline in the territory of the confronting side -- for the start of a ballistic missile, etc.

It is high time official Washington should realize, at long last, that it deals with weapons, which can explode the whole world, and which, even with most careful "concern" for them it will be unable to keep in check. The aspiration to "hang" strike weapons over the earth will, as former U.S. Secretary of Defence H. Brown said, lead to a nightmare, which we will turn over to our children into the 21st century. Mankind should enter that century neither without space nor without nuclear weapons, and in general, without any mass destruction weapons. [sentence as received]

ARBATOV SEES CHANCE FOR 'NORMALIZATION' OF RELATIONS

LD102304 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2120 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Interview with Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow by Budapest Radio correspondents Jozsef Barath and Jozsef Havel; Arbatov answers in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; date not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Havel] We are in the Moscow-based United States of America research institute. The building is the former palace of Princes Volkonskiy: Its atmosphere recalls "War and Peace" by Tolstoy. In fact we are in one of the workshops of Soviet foreign policy; its leader is Academician Georgiy Arbatov, and it is he whom we address.

[Barath] Georgiy Arkadyevich, we know that in the past year Soviet foreign policy has become active in the various regions of the world; in Europe, in Asia, in the Pacific Ocean region. Does this mean that nowadays less importance is attributed to the United States?

[Arbatov] You know, sometimes it would be very pleasant to forget about the United States, but we cannot do so because we see very well how much depends on Soviet-U.S. relations. We do not narrow down the entire world to the United States: We do not see the world through the prism of Soviet-U.S. relations. I would not say that we pay greater attention to one region at the expense of another.

Recently, Soviet foreign policy activity has increased in every direction, in the direction of the United States as well. The 15 January declaration addresses the entire world, but the first phase of disarmament affects the United States first of all.

[Havel] What is the U.S. response to the Gorbachev proposals?

[Arbatov] You know, we cannot have enough patience until the U.S. reply arrives. So far we have only heard some kind of muttering that it is interesting, that it must be studied, that it is the old content in new wrapping. Others talk about dangerous perfidiousness. Reagan himself only said that the plan is being studied. This, of course, is still better than immediate rejection, but we cannot consider all this as a reply. Of course, it is only the most naive people in the United States who can think that these proposals can be left without answer. They must be answered concretely and every single point must be given a reply. This is expected not only by us, but by international public opinion and what is more, the U.S. public opinion also.

A twin difficulty arises with the answers. First, the spirit of our proposals is in contrast to the policy of the United States in the past 5 years, that is, it demands a change. Second, our proposals mean a radical turn regarding any tradition hitherto, even in respect to existing arms limitation, because what is at issue now is the destruction of all offensive weapons.

In the past few days, I have spoken with people of goodwill who are supporting disarmament, but even they are puzzled as to how there can be a life without weapons. For what is at issue here is not only the destruction of nuclear weapons, but chemical and conventional weapons as well.

[Havel] Is the spirit of Geneva operating?

[Arbatov] Geneva has been useful, although no agreement was concluded on the most important issues. Geneva has created an atmosphere in which it was easier to come out with new initiatives.

[Barath] Is it realistic to hope that the United States will join the unilateral Soviet moratorium regarding nuclear test explosions?

[Arbatov] The Soviet proposals have brought the moment of truth: They force the other governments, that of the United States included, to nail their colors to the mast. Take the moratorium for example. When we first raised it, it was said that the Russians were not honest, they carried out more explosions than anybody else -- which, by the way, is not true -- and now they, the Russians, propose to the Americans to stop. By now, however, it is clear to everybody that it is the United States which is ahead. So one argument thus falls by the wayside. The second argument was verification, that the Russians wouldn't agree to it. Now we have said that any form of verification would suit us. The second argument has fallen. The United States is at a crossroads: Either it joins the moratorium and resumes negotiations with us on stopping nuclear experiments or openly admits that it wants to continue the arms race.

The Soviet proposals already have this much benefit at any rate; this is not propaganda, it is politics.

[Havel] Georgiy Arkadyevich, what is new in the new globalism?

[Arbatov] Its unprecedented utopianism and adventurist character.

[Havel] Adventurism existed before that too.

[Arbatov] But they have now taken into their heads that they would give their blessing to every illegal action and this is very dangerous. It is said in the Bible that he who sows the wind shall reap the whirlwind.

[Barath] Regional conflicts, too, play a part in Soviet-U.S. relations. What is the Soviet standpoint on these?

[Arbatov] Well, in connection with every regional conflict we either have a settlement plan or there is a settlement plan with which we agree. Regarding Nicaragua, we support the plan of the Contadora Group; in Afghanistan we are trying to achieve a political settlement. This is being promoted by the fact that the Afghan Government is broadening the social basis of the revolution. Regarding the Middle East, no one has so far come up with a better idea than the 1973 proposal which recommends an international conference with the participation of all interested parties. Without the Soviet Union or the United States participating or Israel or the Palestinians taking part, this issue cannot be solved. In connection with South Africa, our standpoint is the same as the overwhelming majority of the states of the world who are on the side of settling the Namibia question and against apartheid. All the regional conflicts have several parties; the solution must be worked out jointly. The two superpowers cannot arrange this between themselves.

[Havel] A year and a half ago when I began work in Moscow, I read then in one of your articles that Soviet-U.S. relations were at a low point. How do you see this now?

[Arbatov] The situation has somewhat improved in the last year and a half. There are more visits, dialogues in the spheres of culture and air traffic. The most important problems are still unsolved, but it is important that the process has started and this process includes at least a further two summits. This is important because the very fact of a meeting compels us to think, to prepare. By the way, there is no guarantee for anything, but we have greater reason to think that in the coming years a kind of normalization can be expected in Soviet-U.S. relations. It must be seen in its historical context. Relations did not begin in the 1980's and will not end there either -- although the time factor is becoming more and more important. Every wasted year matters more and more.

[Barath] Which are those areas where, in your opinion, realistic conditions exist for an advance?

[Arbatov] It seems to me that in the end it is now time to move from declarations to deeds. The United States has announced several times that it supports nuclear disarmament, but we do not see the practical consequence of this. We have made several steps in advance. Small things, cosmetics, do not solve anything. It would be easy to reach agreement in peripheral problems, but this is not what we would like and the world does not expect this either. We must achieve agreement on the decisive issues.

[Barath] Is it, therefore, the Strategic Defense Initiative which is decisive? Is it what everything else depends on?

[Arbatov] The key question is arms limitation, first of all that of nuclear weapons. In what respect is the Strategic Defense Initiative decisive? In the sense that if the United States implements the "star wars" program then the limitation of strategic weapons is impossible if only because space weapons, in the event they are created, become a part of strategic offensive weapons. At the same time we should not link the cause of limiting medium-range nuclear missiles with the Strategic Defense Initiative. This may be done independently. We do not link with it the armed forces limitation negotiations in Vienna; these may be solved separately even today. And it is true in the case of the themes of the Stockholm Conference. Even in the area of arms limitation many things may be solved independently of the Strategic Defense Initiative. At the same time we cannot expect that the world will become safer if space militarization is implemented.

[Havel] You, as an Americanist, are observing at very close quarters the activity of Ronald Reagan. How do you assess the political profile of the U.S. President?

[Arbatov] I think the time is still to come for Reagan to give an answer to the principal question, that is, what results are to be achieved in his presidential reign. It is not the solution of economic isuses which will be decisive in this respect. The question of security is decisive for the Americans as well, that is, whether security has decreased or increased. It is on this basis that the world will judge him. I think Reagan has every opportunity to enter history as a President who achieved something to be remembered for many long years. However, there is another possibility as well. I am prepared to speak in more detail in response to your question in 2 and 1/2 years time.

POLISH ENVOY'S REMARK AT STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE CITED

LD102117 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Stockholm, February 10 TASS -- Ambassador W. Konarski, head of the Polish delegation, stressed, addressing the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe that the Soviet Union had put forward a concrete and comprehensive program for eliminating the threat of war and ending the arms race. The answers of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the questions of the newspaper L'HUMANITE, he pointed out, are evidence of the Soviet Union's firm intention to lead things to an agreement on a realistic basis in all fields covering nuclear, outer space, chemical and conventional weapons, as well as confidence and security building measures.

In his speech the Polish representative also set forth in a generalized form the stand of the socialist countries on inviting observers to major military exercises.

SOVIET, U.S. DELEGATES COMPLETE ROUND OF TALKS

LD101131 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 10 TASS -- Delegations from the USSR and the United States to the Disarmament Conference have completed here a round of bilateral exchange of views held in line with the agreement between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan on accelerating efforts in order to conclude an effective and verifiable convention on a general and complete ban on chemical weapons and intensifying bilateral discussions at expert level on all aspects of the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons, including verification issues.

DPA REPORTS EAST-WEST 'AGENT' EXCHANGE 11 FEB

LD111134 Hamburg DPA in German 1051 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Berlin, 11 Feb (DPA) -- The exchange of agents between East and West, which has been expected for days, was carried out today on the Glienicke Bridge in Berlin. The mutual handing over of the persons released was performed at the middle of the bridge which links West Berlin and the GDR amid worldwide media interest and with a wide area cordoned off.

The most prominent figure on the exchange list, made known on Monday, is Soviet civil rights activist Anatoliy Shcharanskiy, 37. From the Eastern side, the release of two prisoners from GDR prisons, Dietrich Niestroj and Wolf Georg Frohn, who had been sentenced to life imprisonment for activity as agents for the West, was also planned. Jaroslav Javorsky, who was sentenced to 13 years' imprisonment for aiding an escape, was due to be released from captivity in the CSSR. The people to be released by the West were the American couple Karl and Hana Koecher, who spied in the United States for Czechoslovakia, the Russian, Yevgeniy Zemlyakov, GDR citizen Detlef Scharfenroth, and the Pole, Jerzy Kaczmarek, who were in Federal German prisons.

The actual exchange on the bridge could not be observed from the Western side, because two parked U.S. Volkswagen buses blocked the view. The column with the Eastern agents was escorted by German and U.S. police cars. The persons were sitting in U.S. minibuses. The column also included a car with the East Berlin lawyer, Wolfgang Vogel, who played a decisive part in bringing the exchange about.

The exchange of the middle of the Glienicke Bridge began at 1045 and lasted a good 10 minutes. Then, some of the persons exchanged, evidently including the Soviet dissident Anatoliy Shcharanskiy, drove in a limousine with an American flag past the hundreds of waiting journalists in the direction of the Wannsee. They were escorted by police cars and a police transporter with bars at the windows.

Immediately after his release on Glienicke Bridge, Shcharanskiy drove to the American Tempelhof airport where he arrived at 1121. From here he is to be taken to Frankfurt.

About 30 minutes after Shcharanskiy left in the car of U.S. Ambassador Richard Burt, who welcomed Shcharanskiy on the bridge, the other persons released from the East followed. They drove in a minibus, which was escorted by American and German police cars and an ambulance.

Frankfurt 11 Feb (DPA) -- The wife of Soviet dissident Shcharanskiy arrived at Frankfurt airport on a special Israeli aircraft this (Tuesday) morning. The twin-jet executive jet of the Westwind WW24 type landed at 1128 with Mrs Shcharanskiy on board, an airport spokesman reported. Mrs Shcharanskiy has been completely shielded from the public since her arrival.

Shcharanskiy left Berlin's Tempelhof airport in an American military aircraft heading for Frankfurt at 1236. According to the police, he was accompanied by U.S. Ambassador Burt. The Soviet dissident's wife arrived in Frankfurt in a special Israeli aircraft in the morning.

COMPARSION OF GORBACHEV L'HUMANITE INTERVIEW

Paris L'HUMANITE in French on 8 February carries on pages 14-17 an 8,000 word interview with CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev which has been compared with the Moscow PRAVDA in Russia version published on pages CC 1-13 of the 10 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT and found to be identical.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD092145 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 9 Feb 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, editor in chief of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

Gorbachev Interview in L'HUMANITE

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello there, comrades! On the international arena, our country proceeds from the assumption that foreign policies should be built upon realistic grounds, taking into account arrangement of forces, requirements of the time, interests of one's own people, other peoples and universal peace. That is why the Soviet Union has offered the world a radical and, at the same time, realistic alternative to nuclear war, which takes into account the interests of all peoples -- a program for tackling the problems that mankind faces. The changes in the international atmosphere which followed the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva assist our country in handling the task of elaborating new initiatives in a more resolute way. To realize the Soviet concept of security will, naturally, take a great deal of effort, labor, persistent struggle and breaking millenniums-old traditions. But the world simply cannot go on living and acting as it did; it is unthinkable to preserve human civilization while continuing the accelerating arms race and building up tension. These ideas are at present being adduced and commented upon throughout the world in discussing the replies of Comrade Gorbachev to the questions of L'HUMANITE.

[Volskiy] As well as his talk with editor Leroy.

[Gerasimov] In my view, we can discuss that part of the replies by Comrade Gorbachev that deal with the millenniums-old tradition, which should now be ruthlessly fought with and categorically denied. That is the tradition of relying on weapons and military force. Indeed, as Comrade Gorbachev stressed, it is impossible to live, or, in any case, to live long in the nuclear age having the mentality, habits and rules of behavior of the Stone Age. And such a sharp turn, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said, in international affairs, in the foreign policy vision and practice -- is it not a profoundly revolutionary task? In resolving this task we, the Soviet Union, see our greatest responsibility, our duty, in helping to handle this task.

Yes, of course, the new way of thinking is a very complicated task, and as early as in the fifties, the best intellects of our epoch -- Bertrand Russel, Albert Einstein -- called for it. At present this task has become especially relevant, because nuclear weapons have become increasingly dangerous, and now we are on the threshold of the plans for "star wars," which are going to entrust tackling of the issue of destinies of mankind to some kind of computers. I want to compare here the approach to this problem that the Soviet Union has with the approach of the United States. Recently, the President delivered his traditional State of the Union address, where he said that in order to preserve peace, the U.S. Armed Forces had to be reinforced. So, it was exactly then that the rich United States had to choose between guns and butter. The United States lives beyond its means, the President said, and that is why it is necessary to decide which expenditires must be cut: expenditures for social needs or those of the military. He has no doubts at all that it is necessary to cut expenditures for social needs, and that military spending should, on the contrary, be increased even further. What we have here is exactly an example of the old philosophy, of a purely egotistic approach to the problems of defense, if here we are going to talk about defense and not about the aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism.

[Volskiy] That is, to ensure, or, in any case, to give the appearance of ensuring their security at the expense of other countries which are active in the international community.

Gorbachev Arms Proposals

[Gerasimov] It is interesting that if you take the aims of the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament and those, for example, of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative -- by which I mean the official aim of that initiative -- the aim is in fact the same: to do away with nuclear weapons. The U.S. approach, however, is a technical one. What they are saying is that we must create an anti-nuclear space shield which will protect us from nuclear weapons and thus will render them obsolete and powerless. This is certainly a crooked road to reach that end, even if it should be recognized, I repeat, that this means additional billions of dollars and that it is very doubtful from a technical point of view.

The Soviet Union offers an absolutely straight road -- that of gradual, step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons, which is simple and clear. Apparently, what is involved here is not the official purpose of the Strategic Defense Initiative. There is some kind of different design about it, a perfidious design of, as Comrade Gorbachev described it, this surrealistic plan of delivery from the nuclear threat. Most likely, this is not a plan of delivery from the nuclear threat, but a plan pursuing other ends: preparing an aggression, exerting pressure on the Soviet Union, achieving a technological lead over the Soviet Union by the United States -- these are apparently the real plans of these U.S. "star wars" projects.

But regarding them from the view point of their purpose, what we see here is an example of the two concepts of security: the U.S. concept of security, which rests upon American technical arrogance, focusing on technology -- and the Soviet concept of ensuring equal security for all by reducing armaments and promoting disarmament, including complete elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction.

[Sobolev] A sufficient amount of time has already elapsed since Comrade Gorbachev put forward the wide-scale Soviet program of complete nuclear and chemical disarmament. One can say that the forces approving of and supporting the Soviet program, which are even prepared to undertake practical action to realize it, as, for example, Dante Caputo, the Argentine minister of foreign relations, put it, has shaped itself. This front includes not only progressive public organizations, left parties and associations of peace advocates, the Soviet disarmament program is being welcomed by practically all nonaligned countries headed by India, governments of neutral countries such as Austria, Finland and Sweden, for example, and even of a NATO member-country, that is Greece. It appears that it is about time that those immediately concerned with the Soviet proposals on disarmament should make themselves clear on the subject. However, there is no reply yet.

[Gerasimov] In any case, the Soviet program has certainly caused an abrupt change in international relations.

[Sobolev] Yes.

[Gerasimov] This was particularly mentioned by Senator Edward Kennedy, who visited Moscow recently. He put it this way: Lately, one often felt that we were living through a prolonged winter of our discontent in the field of arms control, and also in the field of other problems that divide us. Now, we feel as if the spring of hope is setting in at last.

[Sobolev] One can even say that the Soviet disarmament program is already working for the benefit of peace, for the benefit of improving international relations and resolving some kind of specific problems. Let us say, for instance, problems of confidence at the Stockholm conference, or the problems concerning reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments which are being discussed at the Vienna talks. All correspondents, all observers, who are present there, note that the atmosphere has changed for the better. Participants in these talks and forums are displaying a more realistic approach to discussion of the issues on the agenda there. As far as the United States is concerned, there was a brief mention that delegations have been sent off, headed by representatives of the President. Their purpose is ostensibly to coordinate the U.S. analysis of the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, and the analysis which is currently being made in Western Europe.

[Gerasimov] There is nothing wrong with that, if there would be a joint answer, should it be a good answer, supporting the Soviet proposals.

[Sobolev] Yes, but unfortunately, in an important governmental document of the United States, for example such as the President's State of the Union address, there is not a single word mentioning the Soviet disarmament program.

[Volskiy] Just a moment ago, when we were talking about the fact that the political atmosphere in the world was improving, one can see there are signs of an opposite process as well; that is, the forces intending to poison the international atmosphere have again become more active. Again, in a number of countries one can observe some increase in anti-Soviet phenomena.

Take France for example. We are in favor of good relations with France; our relations with France are good, and have traditionally been so. In France at the moment we observe a certain increasing wave of anti-Sovietism. Or take the United States: ABC, for instance, has decided to make a television series on what America would be like under Soviet occupation. A provocative venture, indeed, and a venture undertaken by the entertainment programs department.

[Sobolev] This series will appear day after day, and every evening Americans will see how nasty the Soviet people are.

[Volskiy] Well, there is entertainment and then there is entertainment. In the case at issue it is political hooliganism, because even if the Americans who watch this nonsense think it is entertainment, something will nevertheless remain in their minds to the effect that there is, it turns out, a certain probability that the United States will be occupied.

[Sobolev] Yes, and they will get the wrong impression about Soviet people.

[Gerasimov] One which was created long ago, and this is slung in to reinforce it.

[Volskiy] Now, of course, all these tendencies precisely in France and in the United States -- and one could obviously find examples in other countries, too -- show just how hard it is for common sense to find its way through in international relations.

State of the Union Address

[Gerasimov] In general, the State of the Union address which U.S. presidents deliver at the beginning of the year is quite an interesting, specifically American genre of political rhetoric.

Even though these messages are regular, and on the whole routine, those who write them strive at all times to adopt such a high tone, an exceptionally high tone, presenting the current moment as unique and unrepeatable. For example, this time the President announced that the United States had started to move, as though it had been standing still up to now. And if it has started moving in some particular sense, why right now? Reagan, after all, has been President for the last 5 years.

But anyway, no one takes this rhetoric seriously. One should nevertheless treat the address itself seriously, because, of course, behind the splendid phrases lie certain arguments which allow one to perceive the Americans' political intentions.

[Sobolev] It should be said that U.S. observers nevertheless regard such documents ironically, on the grounds that they are bound to contain official optimism. Gerald Ford once very nearly tried to say that the state of affairs in the country was bad, and he rapidly lost his presidential chair. Traditionally, therefore, every president always talks optimistically and only about the good things, trying to circumvent all difficulties, so to speak, all problems and unpleasant aspects of American life, of which there are more than enough.

[Volskiy] That's true. But one cannot pass over all the difficulties. One can, therefore, always trace behind this rhetoric certain topics of concern to Americans. Take the address in question. To summarize its contents briefly, one can do that literally in a few phrases: First, the United States is living beyond its means; the government spends more than the treasury receives. Second, in order to live within one's means, government expenditure must be cut. But military spending must in no way be cut: the Russians would take that as a manifestation of weakness, whereas they must believe the Americans to be strong.

[Sobolev] It is not just a matter of cutting spending, but of increasing expenditure.

[Volskiy] Yes, Reagan is calling for an additional increase in U.S. military spending.

[Sobolev] This is quite at variance with both the spirit of Geneva and, in general, with the current mood reigning in the world.

[Volskiy] In all, the old plan of guns instead of butter. Even wealthy America cannot have both at once. The President is making a clear choice here: he is opting for guns. What is more, the address makes no mention -- the failure to mention this is particularly striking -- of either the Soviet proposals on the program for eliminating nuclear weapons, or of the Soviet-U.S. Geneva accord to strive to prevent an arms race in space and to halt it on earth.

The address is the quintessence of capitalist ideology, because in it the President harshly criticizes what he described as the cult of welfare dependency. He declares the poverty action program to be a senseless waste of dollars and cents.

[Sobolev] Well, on the whole, when he comes out against charity, perhaps he is in fact right, for charity does indeed degrade and depress people. On the other hand, however, what are the literally millions of homeless, unemployed and hungry to do if those programs are stopped? Dozens of these programs are being stopped, so what are those people to do, for ...

[Volskiy, interrupting] They are themselves to blame. The President's philosophy here is interesting.

What is more, it appeals to many people in America. What sort of philosophy is it? Let the unsuccessful weep. Many Americans who are successful are sympathetic to the President's arguments, for these arguments put them in a favorable light as those who can stand up for themselves. This flatters their self esteem. As a result, the essence of the matter is distorted; namely, that there are no equal opportunities in the United States for the poor and the rich, for the blacks and the whites. For instance, many young blacks want to work in the towns and there is no work. They want to study and there is no money for studies.

[Sobolev] It is interesting that no one would ever object to some of the President's phrases if they were taken out of the context of the address. For example, President Reagan expresses his sympathy with freedom fighters suffering behind the walls of repressive regimes. But who does the President of the United States have in mind here? He is expressing his sympathy with Afghan dushmans, the Khmer reactionaries, that is, with all Pol Pot's rabble, with the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries and the mercenaries serving the RSA racists and the United States in Angola, the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] bands.

Savimbi Visit to U.S.

[Gerasimov] Yes, indeed. Savimbi, the leader of the Angolan UNITA terrorists, has just paid a visit to the United States. This was an altogether unprecedented visit.

[Volskiy] At summit level, he was received there by ...

[Gerasimov, interrupting] He was received by Reagan himself; he was received at the State Department, and even, if I am not mistaken, at the CIA as well.

[Volskiy] He was received in the Defense Department, too, by the heads of ...

[Gerasimov, interrupting] And he was not just received, but was promised quite big allocations, and official ones at that, in addition to the secret money he gets through CIA and other channels used by U.S. special services.

[Sobolev] Before it was said that he received through these channels about $15 million a year; now the sum involved is $300 million.

[Gerasimov] Yes.

[Sobolev] And Savimbi himself said in public: Give me more money, because I am the sole protector of your interests in southern Africa.

[Gerasimov] It seems to me that this visit was no isolated event in U.S. political life; no isolated event because they have similar contacts with the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries. There are the dushmans too, who are sent from Afghanistan and who have been received on more than one occasion, I believe, by the President himself, not to mention the fact that large amounts of money and weapons and so forth are given to them. That is, if we follow U.S. policy over the issue of support for counterrevolutionary rebellions, uprisings -- call them what you like -- in developing countries, we can detect a certain logic, which consists in undermining and promoting the elimination of the progressive regimes in states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is interesting here that this is done in the most key points in these developing continents.

Take Central America, for instance. This is, in general, the only land passage, a bridge so to speak, between the United States and the South American continent. That is, a way for the development, so to speak, of U.S. expansion southward. So they are clearing this path, so to speak, with the help of support from the Duarte regime in El Salvador, for example, by means of interference in the affairs of Nicaragua and by sending those same counterrevolutionaries there.

Situation in Haiti

The same thing, in general, applies to Haiti. Haiti is to a certain degree a bridgehead which can potentially be relied upon for actions against South America and even the Central American sector. This is why such a lot of attention is being given to saving the pro-imperialist regime there.

[Sobolev] At a press conference recently U.S. journalists asked Secretary of State Shultz to explain the U.S. position in regard to events in Haiti. The secretary of state replied to the effect that the United States can only be an outside observer, as has always been the case, in accordance with the noble traditions of U.S. foreign policy. One's conscience starts to twitch even to hear such words, frankly. It is the U.S. Embassy in Haiti that is now organizing a change of power which will enable the United States to maintain control of that country. The head of the U.S. diplomatic service is unlikely to be unaware of this, or of the fact that this very sort of operation carries on the traditional U.S. policy in regard to Haiti. In 1915, when the United States occupied Haiti, the commander of the occupying troops and fleet, Admiral Caperton, who became a sort of dictator and governor general, declared: The main aim of my governorship consists in strengthening Haiti's independence. The phraseology, incidentally, is very similar. So, this Caperton, having looked into the matter, ordered Dartiguenave, the president of the Haiti Senate, and a former minister (Bobo) to be brought under guard, and said to them: Gentlemen, it looks as though one of you will be elected president of Haiti. Well now, the admiral, of course, knew what he was saying. Dartinguenave was indeed elected president, since he -- I cite U.S. sources -- showed himself to be a flexible man.

He turned out to be so flexible that he signed without a murmur the text of the constitution which had been drawn up for him by officials of the U.S. Navy Department, who included in it the right by a foreign country, that is, the United States, to interfere in the country's affairs. The parliament, which decided to initiate a discussion on the constitution, was dissolved. And dictator Duvalier, whom the Americans put in power in Haiti 30 or so years ago, was also first checked out for flexibility. Up until 1934 he served in a medical unit of the occupation forces in Haiti, when he was sent for training in the United States, served in the U.S. Navy, and then in the U.S. mission to Haiti. The mission was supposed to be engaged in health care, but it had no success whatever in that area -- as can be seen now in that much-suffering country -- because it had other, more important tasks: it selected the leaders for this U.S. protectorate. What the country was brought to by 30 years of rule by the Duvalier dynasty is unfortunately a long and sorry story. The country is the poorest in the Western hemisphere and one of the fourth poorest in the world.

[Gerasimov] Batista in Cuba; Somosa -- our son-of-a-bitch, as one U.S. President called him -- and his dynasty in Nicaragua; the Duvalier dynasty in Haiti....

[Sobolev] Also, incidentally, the Stroessner dynasty in Paraguay, where his relatives will be assuming power from the current dictator. All these countries under dictatorships are the very poorest ones. In Haiti the majority of the population is living on an annual income of $60. But it would be wrong to blame only Duvalier for this. Almost everything in Haiti belongs to U.S. capital, and it always takes care of itself.

So the conflict in that country -- despite the ferocity of the secret police, who used to be called the Tontons Macoutes, the werewolves, which was a very clever device by the dictator to use a religion of African origin, voodoo, to keep the population in terror, although the Tontons Macoutes did use very real instruments such as pistols and submachine guns -- despite the actions of the Tontons Macoutes, the conflict in Haiti had to transpire, and as you can see now it is developing.

[Gerasimov] And what will happen next?

[Sobolev] In 1915 the United States occupied Haiti, and I am quoting an official document, "in order to forestall any attempt by another country to get a foothold on the American Continent." The Soviet Union at that time, of course, did not exist. In 1965 on the same island of Haiti, but in another country, the Dominican Republic, the United States carried out yet another intervention with the accompaniment of the same old phrases. Now it is thought, in fact by the Western press and Western observers, that another direct U.S. armed intervention is extremely likely, this time in Haiti if the course of events there is not to their liking.

[Gerasimov] L'HUMANITE published an interview with Rene Theodore, the secretary general of the Central Committee of the United Party of Haitian Communists. What he said was that the Communists of Haiti are in favor of setting up a united front of all democratic forces. Here the Communists attach particular importance to the work of the people's committees, underground organizations that operate in all towns throughout the country. But we will see when everything is set up.

Libyan Plane Interception

[Volskiy] Yes, U.S. combat vessels are currently on permanent guard off the shores of Haiti, and it is a far from innocuous guard duty, so to speak. If we recall the U.S. invasion of Grenada, at that time a squadron of U.S. ships was sailing in the Atlantic and no one knew which direction it would turn -- maybe Lebanon, or maybe somewhere else. Yet, it turned toward Grenada where it carried out the intervention that we all know about. The tactics of such intervention from the sea in a regional situation has not in fact changed. The U.S. Navy is now carrying out new maneuvers, or at least is intending to carry out new maneuvers off the shores of Libya. What is interesting is that it was announced in advance, before the new maneuvers, that the U.S. Navy, or aircraft from carriers, intended to violate Libyan territorial waters. So they're already preparing some sort of provocation in advance. Just recently there was the unprecedented case of a piratical attack by Israeli aircraft on a Libyan passenger aircraft flying from Tripoli to Damascus in which there were extremely high-ranking Syrian officials, including the assistant secretary of the regional command of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party.

[Gerasimov] What they said was that they were looking for terrorists, so the Israeli intelligence service made a big mess of it...

[Volskiy] In any case it's just banditry.

[Gerasimov] But that was no justification. Instead they exposed themselves for what they were.

[Sobolev] So, what happened was that they simply seized the wrong aircraft. In principle they are ready to go on seizing aircraft.

[Gerasimov] The Mediterranean used to be known as a place of piracy at sea; now it has become a place of piracy in the air.

[Sobolev] Not only in the air, I think. Israel here is following the example of its older brother, so to speak -- the United States -- thinking that from its own point of view it can do what it likes, disregarding international laws and norms and the security of other people.

[Volskiy] I wonder in fact why precisely now they had to carry out these acts -- I mean the threatening U.S. maneuvers off Libya and this provocation with the aircraft which, as the TASS statement notes quite rightly, whips up tension in the Mediterranean -- and whether this is being done accidentally or deliberately. I think that here there is a large element of the deliberate whipping up of tension, of creating an atmosphere of military threat, which is being done for quite perceptible reasons. The Americans and the Israelis have recently suffered a number of very striking political defeats in the Near East. By this I mean the fact that they did not manage to foist a capitulatory agreement of the Camp David type on Lebanon; the agreement was foisted upon it, but was later rejected. The U.S. troops which formed part of the UN multinational forces, and the multinational forces themselves, left Lebanon. Then the Israeli army was forced to evacuate the greater part of the lands they had seized. So, coming up against all these things, the United States, together with Israel, with whom they have signed an official agreement on strategic cooperation, need to try to break this, for them, negative trend by using strongarm methods to threaten the Arabs and force them, under this threat of force, to accept capitulatory deals. But these methods, I must say, are not new, and not only that, in this case I do not think they are effective.

For example, I recently had occasion to be in Damascus, and the Syrian leaders in particular are extremely optimistic, I would say, about the prospects for the situation in the Near East, and are of the opinion that the trend there is taking shape in favor of a just political settlement of the conflict.

Cuban Party Congress

[Sobolev] Dmitriy Antonovich, we are of the opinion, and this was expressed in the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, that regional conflicts must be solved by collective efforts on a just and equal basis. But at the same time, regional conflicts must not be an obstacle to solving overall security problems. Socialist Cuba is also the subject of constant threats from the United States, so questions of security and sovereignty are of primary importance for our Cuban comrades. There was discussion of this at the 3d Congress of the Cuban Communist Party, which took place this week.

The congress was an important event in itself, but it acquires particular significance in light of the fact that it will soon be followed by congresses of the other fraternal parties which are to solve extremely important questions of a political, economic and social nature. The whole socialist community is faced, albeit to differing degrees, with the need for a sharp turn toward improving efficiency and quality and intensifying production, and it must be said that our joint comprehensive program up to the year 2000 should help all the fraternal countries to solve that problem. Cuba occupies a special place in the socialist community: it is situated, as the Latin Americans say, right by the beard of Uncle Sam, one of whose teeth has bitten right into Cuban territory in the form of the U.S. base at Guantanamo. And defense, as we know, is not cheap.

I would like to compare the situation in Cuba, however, with what is happening in the other Latin American countries. For all of the past 5 years in Latin America, production has been virtually at the same level. In per capita terms it has even fallen considerably down to the 1977 level, which was 9 percent less than the 1980 level. In Cuba, however, the annual growth rate in gross national product over the past 5 years was more than 7 percent. The social picture in Cuba is completely different, too.

There is no illiteracy, no unemployment, and there is an enormous amount of housing construction going on which no other Latin American country can match. Yet housing, health care and education also take a great deal of money from the production sphere.

Latin America is groaning under the burden of foreign debt. As a result of unjust international economic relations, the Western partners of the Latin Americans take away all they have. As far as Cuba is concerned, the majority of its foreign trade -- approximately 85 percent -- is with the socialist countries. It also has foreign debt in Western currency, but a comparatively small amount, and the Cubans are coping with this burden without any particular losses. I think that drawing this parallel between Cuba and its neighbors is extremely indicative. But I would like to note that at the Communist Party congress, the Cubans did not focus attention on their own achievements, but on their failures: the shortages, the errors, problems and tasks for the future. It is just such a businesslike atmosphere that is needed for those tasks to be fulfilled. Here we will end our program. Thank you for listening, and goodbye!

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD071920 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 7 Feb 86

[International Situation: Questions and Answers" program, conducted by Sergey Pravdin, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; with "international affairs journalist" Anatoliy Krasikov and A.V. Mikhaylov, USSR representative at the Vienna MBFR talks]

Gorbachev Arms Proposal

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Our editorial office continues to receive letters whose authors declare their support for the new comprehensive peace proposals set out in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. They criticize the policy of the present Washington administration, aimed at continuing the arms race, transferring it into space, and raising world tension. On this subject we have letters from Comrades Volkov, in the town of Chekalin in Tula Oblast; Alekseyev, in Khabarovsk; Shcherbatenko, in the town of Andropov; Urbaniyazov, in Ashkhabad; Abaluyev, in Chita; Bogatyr, in the settlement of Drabov in Cherkassy Oblast; Feldman, in Moscow, and others. Comrade Gorbachev's statement continues to evoke the broadest response abroad too. I now want to turn to Anatoliy Andreyevich Krasikov, TASS deputy director general, who will talk about some aspects of the Soviet peace program and the world public's reaction to it. Please.

[Krasikov] It must be said that leftwing and democratic circles unreservedly support our program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Moreover, they immediately observed that the program stemmed directly from the general course of our country's policies, and from the spirit and letter of the documents that had been prepared for the forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress. Rightwingers and members of the far-right, on the contrary, do not want to hear about any kind of agreement with our country. There are also those who have not made up their minds, of course. Incidentally, opinions are divided among governments as well. The socialist states are with us, needless to say, since it is our common, coordinated policy. The young developing states have also, in the main, declared themselves in favor. Some, admittedly, remain silent. In the West too, many are inclined to support our ideas. Moreover, even those who openly take their cue from Washington are not saying no. They say that everything has to be weighed and studied, and only then can some final conclusion be drawn.

This week, Reagan sent two of his highly-placed officials abroad. Paul Nitze flew to Europe, and Edward Rowny to Asia. They have to consult with U.S. allies, even though within the Reagan administration itself opinions are also divided. If one believes THE NEW YORK TIMES, for instance, consideration is being given at the same time to three completely different versions of a reply to our proposals. On Tuesday, our foreign minister, Comrade Shevardnadze, spoke to the U.S. ambassador in Moscow, and told him directly: We hope that the U.S. side will not delay giving a reply to proposals which provide a way out of the nuclear impasse. And if, while there is still time, the United States joins in our extended moratorium on all nuclear explosions, a major step will have been taken toward accomplishing the task of nuclear disarmament. However -- and this must not be forgotten -- the new Soviet proposals are addressed not only to the official authorities of the United States and other Western states; they are addressed to all who cherish the cause of world peace, to all people of good will, to all peoples.

[Pravdin] You mentioned the moratorium on nuclear explosions, declared by the Soviet Union, but during this time the U.S. is continuing these explosions and improving their nuclear weapons. Some listeners ask: Is that not detrimental to our security?

[Krasikov] Last August, when the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all kinds of nuclear explosions, we proceeded from the wish to put an end to the creation [sozdaniye] of new, and the improvement [sovershenstvovaniye] of existing, kinds of nuclear weapons. It goes without saying that the Government of the USSR did not have the slightest intention of leaving our country unarmed in the face of the constant build-up of armaments in the West. We wanted to demonstrate that we were prepared, in deed as well as in word, to erect a barrier across the path toward rearmament. And, of course, we expected that the United States and the other nuclear powers would follow our example.

Last year, the leaders of six states on different continents -- Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania and Sweden -- produced a joint appeal to us and to the United States. They called on us to agree on a mutual cessation of nuclear explosions. Recalling that appeal -- it was supported by the peace movement and broad sections of the public in all countries -- we found it possible to give the United States additional time. Why? So that they could think the matter over and join in our initiative. However, the U.S. stubbornly maintained that this was not enough, and that the USSR might deceive them. So we decided to go even further and suggested that we agree on some additional on-site monitoring measures so as to eliminate any possible doubts in the observance of the moratorium. Incidentally, we said we were in favor of establishing strict verification of the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons, which, as our country believes, could be completely eliminated, just like nuclear weapons, by the year 2000.

[Pravdin] What about the "star wars" issue?

[Krasikov] Here, too, the position of the leaders of the six countries that I have already named, the position of the leaders of the Palme Commission, and our own fully coincide. In fact, on this issue the agreement is even broader than on the issue of stopping nuclear tests. Many Western powers, including France, for instance, have come out openly, indeed officially, against the use of space for military purposes. When Reagan was trying to justify his "star wars" project -- he calls it the Strategic Defense Initiative -- we heard quite a few reassuring words. Firstly, it was claimed to be a matter of purely defensive weapons, and, secondly, we were assured -- and they continue to assure us -- that the creation [sozdaniye] of military systems in space will be of great benefit to all mankind because, as they put it, it will make nuclear missile systems unnecessary. However, after the Soviet Union had put forward its program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, many people in the West began to ask: Why create [sozdavat] expensive military systems in space if it is possible to get rid of nuclear weapons without them, moreover, in a far cheaper and more reliable way?

[Pravdin] How did the U.S. Government react to that question?

[Krasikov] It didn't. It pretended that no one had asked any such question. One after another, highly-placed U.S. officials declare that there can be no question of abandoning the Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Pravdin] Anatoliy Andreyevich, some of our listeners are enquiring whether the U.S. has started to have any nagging doubts on this question after the recent disaster with the Challenger space vessel.

[Krasikov] Well, how shall I put it? Doubts have appeared. I could cite the opinion of Grossman, a professor at New York State University, a well-known specialist on space problems. I have brought the relevant passage with me. I will read it: The Challenger disaster has shown the vast danger to mankind inherent in the "star wars" program put forward by the Reagan administration. The scientist continues: Representatives of the U.S. Government have frequently made statements, including statements to me personally, that the likelihood of any accident happening to a shuttle spacecraft is practically nil. However, from the example of the Challenger tragedy we have been convinced that this is not so, and that if anything similar happens during the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative then the consequences will be much more tragic.

[Pravdin] What can be said about the European aspect of our proposals?

[Krasikov] Commenting on the new Soviet initiatives, foreign observers pay particular attention to the proposals aimed at altering and improving the situation in Europe. There is detailed discussion of these initiatives taking place at several international forums. I refer primarily to the conference on confidence-building, security and disarmament measures which, as we know, is underway in Stockholm, and to the Vienna MBFR talks.

The program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in three stages by the year 2000, with the banning -- I stress, with the banning, of space strike weapons -- has struck the imagination of the West Europeans. It has struck them not just with the scale of the aims involved but with the fact that it gives Western Europe the opportunity to make an independent contribution to the cause of disarmament. How does this program differ from our previous proposals? If one is to speak of that part of it which is of direct concern to Europe, then the main difference is that we are agreeing to discuss the question of Britain's and France's nuclear missile weapons separately from the question of U.S. medium-range weapons. This takes into consideration the positions of the two West European nuclear powers which, as we know, have always categorically refused even to allow any reference to be made to their weapons, even in the sense of referring to their numbers because, they say, they do not have any representative weapons there.

Now, in accordance with the program set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev -- in the first stage, at the same time as the steep reduction, the halving, of the USSR's and U.S. strategic weapons -- the Soviet U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone would be subjected to total elimination. Neither the British nor the French nuclear weapons would be put onto the Soviet-U.S. register, so to speak, at that stage.

[Pravdin] Some Western observers have made use of this circumstance to assert that the USSR was accepting Reagan's notorious Zero Option.

[Krasikov] In fact, everything is quite different. The U.S. Zero Option required us to eliminate medium-range missiles not only in the European part but also in the Asian part of the country, where they counter corresponding U.S. weapons.

However, we propose that the question of missiles in Asia should be discussed within the framework of a global solution involving all nuclear powers. We are not refusing to eliminate them, but let the other nuclear powers also eliminate their weapons of this type in Asia.

Further, Reagan's Zero Option proceeded from the basis that the nuclear missile weapons of the two NATO allies of the United States could be retained and improved and infinitum. However, we want the United States to undertake the obligation not to supply strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries, and at the same time we want Britain and France to undertake not to increase their nuclear weapons. In accordance with our plan, the reduction of Britain's and France's nuclear arsenals would start in the second stage, and would begin with the elimination of tactical weapons. Then, in the final, third stage, simultaneously with the total elimination of the USSR's and U.S. nuclear arsenals, the nuclear weapons of all states that possess them would also be totally eliminated.

Well, of course, such a question cannot be decided without the participation of everyone concerned. And, by the way, even before this we were ready to discuss this with Britain and France, but these countries declared that they would not enter into discussions on these questions with us until the nuclear potential of the USSR and the United States had been subjected to a considerable reduction. Our new proposals remove this proviso, since we are proposing to halve our nuclear potential in the first stage. Under these conditions a refusal to enter into talks could come only from people who simply talk about disarmament, talk about their agreement to end the arms race, but who in reality are striving for just the opposite. I am sure that the value of the new Soviet initiatives, apart from anything else, lies precisely in the fact that from now on all nuclear powers, including the United States, Britain and France, must openly make the choice between peace and continuing the arms race.

Progress at MBFR Talks

[Pravdin] Our regular listeners from Moscow, Nikolay Mikhaylovich Devyatkin and the Rudnev family, and also Comrades Vlasenko from Sverdlovsk, Khachaturyan from Yerevan, Yevgeniya Yevgeniyevna Kiriyevskaya from Tula Oblast, ask how the Vienna MBFR talks are progressing, and about the peace proposals of the USSR and the other countries of the Warsaw Pact introduced at this forum. Esteemed comrades, Averyan Vladimirovich Mikhaylov, the USSR's representative at these talks, replies to your questions.

[Mikhaylov] Last February, the USSR and the countries of the Warsaw Pact proposed to their partners in the talks to seek an accord by which the USSR and the United States would partially reduce their armed forces, say by 20,000 for the USSR and 13,000 for the United States, together with their corresponding armaments and military equipment with a subsequent freezing of the level of the armed forces and armaments both of the NATO countries and the countries of the Warsaw Pact in this region. We also envisaged appropriate measures to monitor the fulfillment of such an agreement.

It must be said that the Western side remained silent for 10 months, giving as the reason for this that they were studying our proposal. Finally, on 5 December of last year, the Western side put forward their counterproposals on this question. The West, in principle, seemed to agree to the ideas that we put forward for an initial reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops in conjunction with no subsequent increase in the level of the armed forces of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact countries in central Europe.

It would seem that the general direction of further talks and certain outlines for a possible accord are now coming into view.

I would say that this confirmed the appropriateness and constructive nature of the proposal made by the socialist countries last February. It has made it possible to overcome the impasse that our talks had reached. It is to be hoped that the appearance of coinciding elements in the present positions of the sides will make the further discussion of questions at our talks more purposeful and more meaningful, and will make the search for mutually acceptable solutions more realistic.

However, one cannot fail to make note of the fact that the Western proposals continue to be biased and unbalanced on a whole range of aspects and, I would say, are unrealistic and not in accord with the principle of not damaging the security of the sides -- a principle which was agreed upon at the start of the talks.

Thus, the positions of the sides are still fairly far apart. Nonetheless, we believe that it is still possible to reach agreement in Vienna both on the essence of the initial agreement and on measures for adequate monitoring of its fulfillment. One thing, however, is required for this: Mutual display of political realism and readiness to seek compromise decisions which do not damage either of the sides. For our part we have displayed this readiness; now let our partners display it, too.

ANZUS Pact

[Pravdin] Our regular listeners, the Smyurdze family from Kaluga, ask us to tell them about New Zealand, and the reason for the current serious conflict between that country and the United States.

The Labor Party of New Zealand came to power in the country after the elections in July 1984. The leader of that party, Lange, is now prime minister. It was also after these elections that the conflict with the United States began, the problem our listeners are asking about. One of the points, indeed the main point, of the Labor Party's election program was the promise to ban foreign ships fitted with nuclear engines or carrying nuclear weapons from calling at New Zealand ports.

It must be said that Lange is by no means an enemy of the United States, as certain sections of the U.S. press try to present him. He has frequently stressed that the government he heads is simply striving to implement the promise he made to the electorates. However, Washington immediately regarded New Zealand's decision as an attempt to undermine U.S.-New Zealand relations and also the so-called Pacific Ocean security pact -- ANZUS in abbreviated form -- which includes Australia, as well as these two countries. This year ANZUS was to have marked its 25th anniversary, but one hears more funeral than celebratory music in Washington about this bloc. The point is that in spite of strong pressure from the United States -- diplomatic, political, economic, and so forth -- the Lange government has not altered its decision. Moreover, it has taken steps to include it in legislation. The appropriate bill has been introduced for parliamentary discussion. However, the United States has not given up its crude attempts to dictate its will to this independent country. A group of U.S. congressmen recently declared that it was necessary to end New Zealand's membership in the ANZUS bloc and to deprive it of the so-called U.S. nuclear umbrella.

But this is not intimidating the New Zealanders: Two thirds of the population now live in towns and villages which have declared themselves to be nuclear-free zones. The bill drawn up by the Lange government envisages the declaration of a nuclear-free zone for all the country, its territorial waters and airspace. Thus, New Zealand is striving to make its contribution to the implementation of the treaty on declaring the southern part of the Pacific Ocean a nuclear-free zone. This document was signed last August by 13 states of this region, including New Zealand. As Prime Minister Lange stated recently in an interview with the U.S. newspaper NEWSDAY, New Zealand intends to dissociate itself from any nuclear strategy.

REPORTS ON CHALLENGER EXPLOSION, INVESTIGATION

Commission Demands Documents

LD101451 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov reports:

William R. Rogers, former U.S. secretary of state, and now chairman of the special presidential commission on the space shuttle Challenger accident, has demanded that the leadership of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) grant him all documents having to do with the report that the accident could be caused by the unservicable system for the hermetic sealing of the sections of solid fuel boosters. As the CBS Television company said, the commission will study these documents at a special session behind closed doors today. On Tuesday it is planned to hold a session on the same issue open to the public.

THE NEW YORK TIMES was the first to report that the hermetic sealing was unreliable. Then the report was confirmed by other publications. The newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST pointed out quoting NASA officials that the most vulnerable spot in the sections of solid fuel boosters could be special hermetic seals, which are rings of special rubber with a diametre of 3.7 metres. The seals as the newspaper said, were damaged at least 12 time in the preceding flights of the shuttle spaceships.

The AP agency points out in its latest reports on the investigation into the accident that the Challenger exploded after the envelope of the section of solid fuel boosters broke in the place of sealing or in the seal itself. The flame spewing from the rupture probably ignited the fuel tank of the space shuttle.

Next Three Launches Postponed

LD110826 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 11 TASS -- AP reports that the next three planned missions of shuttle spaceships have been postponed because of the Challenger disaster. The launching of Columbia, scheduled for next March, has been delayed at least to late Autumn this year. The launching of two ships in May to put into orbit the Galileo automatic probe to study Jupiter and an automatic interplenatary probe to explore the solar poles have been put off by 13 months.

Engineer Reflects on Disaster

PM101611 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 p 4

[Article by Yu. Markov, space devices test engineer, under the rubric "Expert Opinion": "Death of the Challenger : An Engineer's Reflection on the Disaster to the Spaceship Challenger "]

[Text] "... One of the two solid fuel boosters exploded." "The explosion was the consequence of the uncontrolled mixing of liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen... The cause of the explosion could have been the failure of a turbine in the main engine, with a tiny fragment of metal finding its way into the main fuel tank..."

"The disaster took place in the 75th second after the launch, moments after the commander began to throttle up the engines..." "For the first 2 minutes after the launch, the astronauts can do nothing, because they are 'pressed' into their seats, and operations are carried out by the on-board computer..."

"A flame burst from the /NOSE CONE/ of one of the boosters..." "A tongue of flame appeared in the /LOWER SECTION/ of the body of the right-hand booster just above the nozzle..." [uppercase passages between slantlines are printed in boldface]

How many contradictory, mutually exclusive versions we have heard, read, and seen concerning the destruction of the space shuttle Challenger ["Brosayushchiy Vyzov"] -- that is the translation of the name of the second ship under the space shuttle program.

I am not suggesting that the American astronauts and experts, commentators, and journalists whose versions we have cited were deliberately misleading the public: It was simply a very complex and rapid process which led to the Challenger accident. I believe that as a result of careful analysis of video and telemeter tapes, modeling of the process, and attempts at least partially to reproduce it with technological devices, American engineers will be able to understand the cause of the disaster and make the necessary material modification. However, another possibility is not excluded: A single, 100-percent cause, so to speak, will not be established, and the conclusion will be: "The most likely causes of the explosion were...," and then experts will elaborate measures to eliminate the "likely causes," and the ships will fly again...

I would like to point out one serious psychological aspect which accompanies investigations of this kind and seriously complicates them. Who knows the subtleties of his system's operation best? Of course, the expert, the designer, the tester. But it can be very difficult for him, realizing that the cause of a failure could be isolated and accidental, to acknowledge that his firm is to blame. The news has come in that a presidential commission has been set up to investigate the causes of the disaster, and that it includes Neil Armstrong, the first man on the moon. Yes, the ships will fly again. And an accident with precisely the same cause is unlikely to happen again. But another accident could happen, and its consequences will be equally sad. Why such pessimism, you may ask? No, it is not pessimism, it is looking at things realistically. Let us take a brief look at the shuttle's design.

Standing vertically on the launchpad is a huge "cigar" nearly 50 meters long and 9 meters in diameter (red, on the television screen). That is the fuel tank for the spaceship's engines, consisting of two compartments and filled with five-sixths fuel -- liquid hydrogen -- and one-sixth oxidizer -- liquid oxygen. Attached to the tank are two "sharpened pencils" -- the solid fuel boosters. The solid fuel is a mixture of 70 percent aluminum perchlorate, 16 percent powdered aluminum, and 12 percent synthetic rubber, complex in structure, as well as a couple of percent of other components. Also "stuck" to the tank is the orbiter -- the space glider itself. It is incorrect to call it a spacecraft -- it cannot fly, it can only glide. The mass of this whole system on launching is...2,000 tons. The mass of the rocket fuels accounts for more than 1,700 tons of this. That is 1,700 tons of "explosive"! And what explosive! The entire art and skill of the designer, the engineer, and the worker are channeled into preventing it from exploding. I am confident that by the 21st century people will go into space by other means, rather than riding an a "fire-breathing dragon."

Let us observe a normal shuttle flight. During the launch, all the engines are switched on at once -- the boosters and the ship's own engines. At an altitude of approximately 40 km the boosters detach themselves (they then drop into the ocean on three parachutes and are towed back to the launch complex; after repair and refuelling, they are used again -- up to 20 times). When suborbital velocity is reached, on the very "frontier" of space, when the fuel has burned out the fuel tank is discarded (on the way back to earth, it breaks up in the dense strata of the atmosphere). The "bird" carrying the crew is guided into orbit -- or rather, the last part of the way into orbit -- by means of small liquid fuel maneuvering rocket engines.

After doing its work in space, the space glider descends from orbit and glides into land on a runway. All clear and simple, it would appear. But what dangers lie in wait for the cosmonauts!

Of course, questions of the crew's safety are carefully considered. Of course, various systems are designed (ARS -- Accident Rescue System, VSS -- Vehicle Safety System, SSS -- Ship Safety System) to automatically take emergency measures to save the people on the basis of signals from various sensors in the event of an unplanned, dangerous increase in temperature, pressure, and so forth. But their potential on the shuttle is limited.

If, for instance, a crack appears in the body of the booster or if its welded seam parts (and that is what experts investigating the recent disaster are inclined to think, and a tongue of flame is indeed visible on the video pcitures), then an explosion is inevitable, and there can be no rescue. Incidentally, the Challenger tragedy could have taken place on 30 August 1983, if one of the boosters had operated for another 14 seconds -- on that occasion, the nozzle's heat insulation practically burned through. There is still hope for the astronauts if the VSS "senses" the undesirable phenomena in time and separates the ship, together with the fuel tank, from the booster: The separation of the ship alone, without the tank, offers no particular chance of survival, since the engines will be left without fuel. Then, having achieved the necessary reserve of altitude, the cosmonauts will detach the tank and attempt to glide.

Landing the shuttle is a complex process. Even its normal landing velocity is some 350 km per hour -- far higher than any fighter plane. The shuttle's high landing speed certainly involves considerable risk. Coming into land without a working engine and gliding without the possibility of going around again if you miss it, as any aircraft can do -- all this demands the highest skill and attention on the part of the cosmonauts. That is why Francis Scobee, commander of the Challenger who had already flown it as copilot, once joked darkly: "This thing's going to blow up some time."

Just imagine this picture: the ship has already left orbit, and at that time something unforeseen happens in the landing region or to the runway itself...

The shuttle's crew are not now provided with spacesuits or ejector seats. And it is not hard to imagine what would happen to people if the ship depressurized in orbit or in the rarefied strata of the atmosphere.

So we can see how unsafe this system is even in normal conditions! We can see how much it needs normal, calm, prolonged and thorough preparations. In a war situation the system is extremely vulnerable, but it could play a considerable and sinister role in preparations for "star wars." We sympathize with the relatives of those who died and we understand the situation of the engineers and workers who prepared the ship for launch -- things are very difficult for them now.

When it is reported that a high-school teacher was to have given lessons for schoolchildren while in orbit, I find this idea sympathetic: It expands the framework of our ideas about the universe and helps to raise future specialists in cosmonautics (although it is said that her flight was aimed at lessening the friction between the administration and the country's education workers trade union and smacked of a public relations exercise). When it is reported that it was proposed to study Halley's Comet from on board the ship, such experiments can only be welcomed. But when we learn from the same reports that a number of specific objectives of the flight were in pursuit of the interests of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), or in other words the militarization of space, and that the coastguard command is worried about the search for a "green tin canister" and declare: "Anyone who touches it will be dead in 2 second," such reports cannot but cause us to feel bitterness and alarm.

The idea of the possibility of destroying nuclear weapons on earth from space is utopian. If a "star war" starts, it will become an earth war without fail. How right the scientists and commentators are when they point out what could happen if a similar disaster took place in the conditions of a tense situation when SDI systems had been deployed. Yes, the situation could get out of control...

I subscribe to the words of Professor K.P. Feoktistov, spaceship designer and cosmonaut: "Of course, the creation of the shuttle was an impressive engineering achievement for American space rocket and aircraft technology. ...Articles are appearing more and more often to the effect that the main purpose of the shuttle system is military... All this is very sad, and it has been repeated more than once: The sophisticated achievements of science and technology have been used to create means of destruction -- that is, they have struck at the people who created them."

Yet how much one would like to forecast the weather and study the stars together with American experts, to fly to Mars together...

KENNEDY PRESS CONFERENCE IN U.S. REPORTED

PM101105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Sincere Desire"]

[Text] Washington, 9 Feb -- Senator E. Kennedy, a prominent U.S. public and political figure, declared that the Soviet Union sincerely desires success at the talks on nuclear and space arms.

The senator gave a press conference at one of the halls in Congress on Saturday, following his return from Moscow where he was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, and also had meetings with representatives of Soviet scientific circles. E. Kennedy emphasized the firmness of the Soviet Union's stance aimed at preventing the transfer of the arms race to outer space. The senator also noted the importance of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and expressed the opinion that meetings between the top leaders of the USSR and the United States are of enormous significance for the cause of progress in relations between the two countries.

Answering a question regarding his attitude toward the "star wars" program, E. Kennedy stressed that he has been and still is against the militarization of outer space, and is a firm supporter of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty.

LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS ARRIVE IN U.S.

LD102013 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 10 TASS -- Foreign ministers of eight Latin American countries arrived in Washington for talks with U.S. secretary of state and other high officials of the U.S. Administration about the situation in Central America. Representatives of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay will set out to the U.S. Administration the plan of peaceful settlement in the region which has been endorsed at a meeting in Caraballeda, Venezuela, last month.

As Argentina's Foreign Minister Dante Caputo stressed after the arrival in Washington, such proposals represent the sole path to the solution of problems in Central America. According to the minister, this is a balanced plan in which the interests of all sides are taken into consideration.

U.S. NAVAL MANEUVERS OFF LIBYAN COAST REPORTED

'Permanent Pressure' Desired

LD102027 Moscow TASS in English 0605 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 10 TASS -- NEWSWEEK Magazine, with reference to high-placed spokesmen of the Pentagon, reports that the United States has decided to take another step in the escalation of the "war of nerves" against Libya. Apart from holding provocative naval exercises during which an order will be issued to the ship-based aircraft of the U.S. sixth fleet to intrude into Libya's air space, it has been decided to ensure U.S. permanent naval presence near the shores of that Arab state. The magazine points out that some officials of the Reagan Administration expect through a permanent military pressure to provoke Libya into taking reply measures, which would give the USA a pretext for a direct armed intervention.

'Provocative' Maneuvers Expected

LD110614 Moscow TASS in English 0542 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 11 TASS -- The American military intends to resume shortly its provocative manoeuvers off the coasts of Libya. A large naval battle group comprising about twenty warships of the U.S. 6th Fleet led by the aircraft-carriers Coral Sea and Saratoga is being concentrated in the area.

According to the Associated Press report, a notification has been sent to the International Civil Aviation Organization saying that carrier-based aircraft of the U.S. Navy will carry out air operations in the region serviced by Tripoli airport dispatchers from February 12 to 15.

In January, the Pentagon held major air exercises in the region, involving carrier-based F-14 fighters and F-18 fighter-bombers.

REAGAN RADIO ADDRESS CONFIRMS DOMESTIC CUTS

LD102220 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Feb 86

[V. Dunayev report from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As was confirmed by President Reagan in his latest radio address, the U.S. Administration intends to achieve a cut in federal spending mainly at the expense of those programs which are vitally important for millions of the most hard-up Americans.

[Dunayev] When the U.S. President delivered to Congress his annual address -- or as they say here, the State of the Union message -- yet another message about the State of the Union which differed sharply from that made by the President, was heard simultaneously only two streets away from the capitol. And although it is not going to get the same press, all the same, wihout this message, it is difficult to imagine the true situation in America.

The message was read out from the steps of a temporary refuge for the homeless by the homeless and the unemployed themselves, not by speakers. The message was on their behalf; on behalf of the 800 people of Washington who come to this refuge at night; on behalf of the 50,000 people who spend the night on the street in Los Angeles; on behalf of the 10,000 homeless children of New York. There was no ovation here as there was in Congress when the President spoke: There was nothing to applaud. The President invited four young people to Congress who had achieved distinction during the past year and congratulated them warmly before the eyes of the whole country. Children were also received at the ceremony that took place in the Washington shelter: six homeless boys and girls, six out of the 6 million starving children in the U.S. six out of the 14 million who live beyond the brink of poverty, six out of an unkown number of homeless waifs, six whose ages ranged from 8 months to 12 years. They are not the majority in the U.S., things have not gone that far: but there are ever increasing numbers of poor children in the rich U.S.

When the President talked about a strong America, he had in mind missiles and squadrons; while they, the homeless children of America, think that a strong country is a country which does not deny a roof overhead to its children and does not deny work to their fathers, its citizens. Two messages about the state of the union were heard through Washington.

INCREASED MILITARY SPENDING IN U.S. DISCUSSED

LD101916 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 10 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpt] Where do the huge sums of money pumped out of the U.S. taxpayer go? Primarily into military expenditure, which amounts -- taking into account only allocations to the Pentagon -- to 27 percent of the total federal budget. And in the United States military expenditure is incurred not only under Pentagon items but also, for example, by the Department of Energy. It supervises, in particular, the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Incidentally allocations for nuclear weapons are a very considerable item in the Pentagon's balance sheet.

This includes expenditure on manufacture of another 21 MX ICBMS with 10 nuclear warheads each, the construction of another 5 missile-carrying submarines, the purchase of another 200 aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons, and the development [razrabotka] of a new mobile midgetman ICBM. At the same time, major allocations are envisioned also for military space programs. They are to be increased in the next financial year by 75 percent to $6.5 billion. And in the 5-year period expenditure on the "star wars" projects is planned to reach $42 billion.

What is the result? Quite recently Washington was saying that implementation of the military space programs -- officially called the Strategic Defense Initiative -- makes nuclear weapons superfluous. Now, as we see, it is planned to build up both. Washington's recent statement that the US arms build-up is allegedly an answer to the actions of the Soviet Union does not stand criticism. An official report by the U.S. Chiefs of Staffs Committee sent to Congress in connection with the debates on the Budget admits not only nuclear parity between the United States and the USSR but also consistent fulfillment by the USSR of the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, named SALT-II, signed in the summer of 1979 in Vienna but never ratified by the United States.

All these facts are much talked about and disputed in the United States not only in connection with the debates on the budget but also in connections with the broad response here to the new peace initiatives of the USSR set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and confirmed in his answers to questions from L'HUMANITE.

For instance, the statements by Townsend Hoopes, former undersecretary of the Air Force and now chairman of the Consultative National Security Council, are noteworthy. The new Soviet proposals, he writes in NEWSDAY are an eloquent call to the U.S. President to assume his share of responsibility and look straight at the fact that national security can no longer be guaranteed unilaterally regardless of how much money is spend on the armed forces and on new technology.

Similar statments have been made in the United States especially after the disaster of the Challenger spacecraft. True, a session of the special presidential commission conducting an inquiry is still meeting behind closed doors. At the same time, reports have been leaked to THE WASHINTON POST that NASA was under pressure to keep to a tight schedule of flights in reusable spacecraft, although, as has become known, recently there were four major explosions which caused casualties at the factories of the Norton company which makes the solid fuel boosters.

And here is the conclusion arrived at in an open letter published in THE NEW YORK TIMES by two United States scientists: The tragedy of the Challenger [sozdaniye] of an anti-missile defense system with space-based elements. The "star wars program would turn the United States into a spacecraft, making the existence of the entire population dependent on U.S. technology which, as we see, is definitely not fault-free.

Still more critical statements are being heard in the West European NATO allies of the United States. This is particularly noted by U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT. It writes that the West Europeans are worried by the "star wars" programs.

Indeed, here are some reports from the FRG, for instance, visited recently by two United States envoys -- Assistant U.S. Secretary of State Whitehead and the President's special envoy on disarmament problems Nitze. Both of them tried hard to influence both the government and the public of the FRG who have been more and more actively supporting the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. Now Washington's envoys, speaking in Bonn, have been vying with one another to assure the people that President Reagan is just on the point of answering the Soviet proposals.

But so far something different has been noted in the FRG. The HAMBURG SPIEGEL shows in this diagram that U.S. military expenditure -- despite all the promises -- has not gone down but on the contrary has increased. And to illustrate this the journal publishes another diagram showing the rise in profits of one of the major military firms of the United States, IBM, engaged in the manufacture of electronics for missile, space, and nuclear programs.

JOINT CHIEFS URGE SUPPORT FOR 'GLOBAL ROLE'

PM101045 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Course of Militarization"]

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb -- The U.S. Joint Chiefs view the entire globe and space near the earth as a U.S. domain. The pages of their annual report "The U.S. Military Position in the World and Fiscal 1987" intended to reinforce the Pentagon's budget request this year for the astronomical sum of $311.6 billion literally bristle with concepts such as "U.S. global interests," "free access to all seas and oceans and outer space," "access to sources of raw materials," and so forth.

The Joint Chiefs claim that the U.S. Armed Forces are now playing a "global role," since, they say, "the United States has global interests and obligations." On that basis and reinforcing their arguments with the hackneyed thesis of the "Soviet military threat," they are demanding that Congress approve all the Pentagon's budget requests for fiscal 1987. The report's authors insist on building up and modernizing both U.S. strategic and conventional arms and strengthening the U.S. military presence in Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean areas.

The compilers of the report are militating for new multibillion-dollar spending programs in order to enhance the mobility of U.S. Armed Forces by increasing the potential for transferring them to any part of the globe and expanding the network of U.S. military, air, and naval bases abroad. They are devoting particular attention to the questions of building up the might and mobility of the Marine Corps and special purpose troops.

Devoting main attention to the sphere of the strategic arms buildup, the Joint Chiefs state with satisfaction that the "United States is continuing to give priority to the modernization of its strategic arsenal by developing [razrabotka], creating [sozdaniye], and deploying systems such as space arms, MX, Midgetman, and Trident ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and the latest bombers, including the B-1B."

NEW FIRM TO HANDLE BORDER TRADE WITH PRC

PM110959 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Feb 86 p 3

[Interview with V. Lozovoy, general director of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade's "Dalintorg" all-union association, by TRUD correspondent V. Chetvergov: "Introducing 'Dalprigran'" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] "Dalprigran" -- that is the name of a new foreign trade firm which has opened in Maritime Kray. Its "headquarters" is located in the city of Nakhodka. At the request of TRUD correspondent V. Chetvergov, this event is commented on by V. Losovoy, general director of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade's "Dalintorg" all-union association:

[Chetvergov] Valeriy Konstantinovich, why has "Dalprigran" been set up?

[Lozovoy] As has alreasy been reported in the press, trade talks were successfully completed in Beijing the other day between USSR and PRC gpvernment delegations. A protocol on trade turnover and payments for 1986 was signed. Trade ties between our countries continue to develop steadily. That is why a new specialized firm was created at the beginning of this year within the system of our "Dalintorg" association, to take on all cross-border trade with the PRC.

[Chetvergov] What goods will the Soviet Union be receiving from China in the near future and what will it supply inexchange?

[Lozovoy] Machines and equipment for various sectors of industry, means of transport, ferrous metals, fertilizers, and commercial lumber will be supplied to the PRC from the USSR. Chinese organizations offer their traditional goods: light and food industry products.

PAPER NOTES PRC MILITARY COMMISSION MEETING

PM111005 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb Second Edition p 3

["Own information" report: "Report in RENMIN RIBAO"]

[Text] RENMIN RIBAO has reported that the third plenum of the PRC Central Military Council Discipline Verification Commission was held in Beijing from 27 January through 2 February. The plenum participants, the report states, analyzed the situation among the troops and formulated practical measures to implement the decisions of the CPC Central Committee and the Central Military Council concerning the "rectification of party style." The speakers pointed out that in 1986 it is necessary to strive for "a fundamental change in the observance of party style in the Army, starting with leading organs and leading cadre workers." It was emphasized at the plenum that "the Army must march in the vanguard of the movement for rectification of the style of party work."

CRITICISM OF 'TEAM SPIRIT-86' EXERCISES REPORTED

Rehearsal for Nuclear War

LD101439 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 10 TASS -- In connection with the U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises, which began today, the supreme commander-in-chief of the Korean People's Army has ordered that all military and para-military units be put on full combat alert. This self-defense measure has been taken in order to foil resolutely all enemy intrigues, to defend the homeland reliably, says the announcement by the supreme commander-in-chief of the Korean People's Army issued by the CENTRAL KOREAN NEWS AGENCY here today.

"The war-mongering actions of the USA and the Seoul regime are an open challenge to the Korean people, create a serious threat to peace in Asia and all over the world," says the announcement. Taking part in the exercises are more than 200,000 servicemen, among whose weapons are aircraft carriers, strategic bombers and missiles. Large quantities of U.S. nuclear weapons are deployed in South Korea.

The "Team Spirit-86" exercises are a rehearsal of a nuclear war against the DPRK, an attempt at heightening tensions in Korea to the limit. Such is the answer of the USA and the South Korean authorities to the decision of the DPRK Government not to hold big military exercises beginning from February 1, this year, and halt all war games during the North-South dialogue, and to its call for joining in that move.

The "Team Spirit-86" exercises have been described by the supreme commander-in-chief of the Korean People's Army as a "reckless military provocation of the U.S. imperialists and their South Korean puppets."

Undermines Asian, Pacific Security

LD101645 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Vladimir Korolev commentary]

[Text] A joint American-South Korean exercise, "Team Spirit-86", has got underway. The large scale maneuvres involve over 200,000 servicemen and a large quantity of aircraft, naval vessels and advanced hardware. Our observer Vladimir Korolev comments:

The exercise is clearly provocative by nature. Troops are reported to be practicing offensive operations and learning actions in the conditions of the use of nuclear weapons, and there are such weapons in South Korea, where United States military bases have up to 1000 nuclear warheads and means of their delivery. To justify the maneuvres the Pentagon's chief, Caspar Weinberger, has alleged that there is a threat of attack from the north. But this is a deliberate lie. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a peace-loving state that does not intend to attack anyone. Otherwise it wouldn't have proposed recently that military exercises should not be conducted on the Korean Peninsula and around it. And Pyongyang's overall policy is aimed at turning the peninsula into a region of peace.

Washington and Seoul describe "Team Spirit-86" as an allegedly bilateral exercise. Nevertheless, there is in fact a third participant, Japan, for transport planes with troops and military equipment have been dispatched from American bases in Japan to South Korea. Besides, Japan itself is now the site of Japanese-American maneuvres, (?sugaru-86), in which the transfer of commandos to any part of Asia is being tested. This makes the current demonstrations of military force in the Far East look more ominous than at first glance. It's also indicative that the exercises are underway in the immediate proximity to the Soviet Union's Far Eastern frontiers and affect the interests of this country's security.

The Soviet News Agency TASS has issued a statement denouncing the "Team Spirit-86" exercise in South Korea. The USSR regards this as undermining security in Asia and the Pacific and threatening the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, other peace-loving nations and univeral peace.

U.S. Intimidation Displayed

LD102219 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Commentary by All-Union Foreign Policy Correspondent Nikolay Agayants from the "International Diary, Facts, opinions" Program Presented by Vladimir Pasko]

[Text] Large-scale maneuvers have begun in the area of the Korean peninsula by the U.S. Armed Forces and the Seoul regime under the code name "Team Spirit-86." I invite my colleague, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio Nikolay Agayants, to tell you about this in greater detail:

In order to attain its hegemonist goal and to bring pressure of force to bear upon governments which refuse to submit to U.S. diktat, the Washington administration is resorting to its practice, increasingly frequently, to demonstrations of militar might, to muscle flexing as they say. A prominent position in this arsenal of i timidation and blackmail is now allocated to all kinds of maneuvers. Literally a day passes without there being a report on the start of fresh exercises with the participation of the Navy, Air Force, the Green Berets or the land forces of the United States. And what titles they think up for these provocative games in the Pentagon -- "Rimpac," (? Sugaru), "Bright Star," "Exotic Palm," "Ocean Safari" -- They go on and on. And now some information about the "Team Spirit-86" meaneuvers.

I will remind you that more than 200,000 American and South Korean servicemen, air force and support units from dozens of U.S. military bases located on the territory of the United States itself, on the Hawaian islands, Guam, the Philippines and Japan have been mobilized for these exercises. Warships of the American 7th Fleet, subdetachments of the Marines and of the special purpose troops will take part in the maneuvers. The aim of thisundertaking is to work out large-scale landing operations and to improve preparations for joint combat actions of an offensive nature using means of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

The "Team Spirit-86" military exercises, which are being held in direct proximity to the frontier of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, should be evaluated as another dangerous step in the military links between Washington and Seoul. Allow me to note that, through the efforts of the Pentagon brasshats, South Korea has long since been transfomred into the region's powder-magazine.

Fanning the myth of a threat from the north, the present Washington administration and the Seoul regime are continuing stubbornly to hold a course towards stepping up militarist preparations and escalating tension in the Far East. In South Korea today there are 40 U.S. bases, and a whole complex of stockpiles of nuclear weapons whose overall might surpasses that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima by 820 times over. Furthermore, the Pentagon is now hatching plans for the deployment in South Korea of Pershing-2, Tomahawks and neutron weapons.

The TASS statement on "Team Spirit-86" says clearly and precisely, I quote: The Soviet Union condemns resolutely the provocative militarist games by the U.S. and South Korean military in the south of the Korean peninsula, which are undermining foundations of security in the Asian Pacific Ocean region and which carry a threat to the DPRK and to other peace-loving states, as well as to the whole world.

DPRK Condemns Exercises

LD101920 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, 10 TASS -- The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Korean people strongly denounce the militaristic intrigues of the U.S. and South Korea which are regarded by them as an open challenge to all those who come out for a dialogue and peace in Korea, as actions undermining peace in Asia and the world over. This is pointed out in a statement of a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made in connection with the U.S.-South Korean military exercise "Team Spirit-86" which started today in the south of the Korean peninsula.

Facts show that this muscle-flexing demonstration is a rehearsal of a nuclear war aimed at the realization of the U.S. aggressive designs with regard to the whole of Korea and Asia in general, the statement stresses. It turns down the attempts of Washington and Seoul to present the started military exercise as a "defensive" one. The scope of the military exercise in which over 200,000 officers and men are taking part, including U.S. units from the territory of the U.S. itself and from its bases in the Pacific, aircraft carriers and other naval ships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, as well as the fact that they are equipped with nuclear weapons and the very character of actions of the troops -- all this shows that the purpose of the military exercise is the training of large-scale offensive operations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The statement underlines that the hostile action of the U.S. and its partners is being taken at the time when the whole world welcomed the decision of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea not to stage major military exercises in the Korean peninsula and around it as of February 1 and to refrain from any military exercises during the talks with South Korea. However, Washington and Seoul left unanswered the appeal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to follow its example. This is why they are to bear full responsibility for the breakup of the dialogue between North and South Korea, for a new aggravation of the situation in that region.

The U.S. should immediately stop the started military exercise and to withdraw its troops from South Korea together with nuclear and other death-carrying weapons, the statement stresses. The government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea expresses hope that governments, peoples, international organizations and peace champions in all the countries will actively support the struggle of the Korean people against the instigative actions of the U.S. and the South Korean authorities, for ensuring peace and achieving a peaceful unification of Korea.

ARKHIPOV RECEIVES DRA MINES, INDUSTRY MINISTER

PM1010593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 86 First Edition p 6

[TASS report under general Headline: "Developing Ties"]

[Text] On 5 February I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received N. (Nasir), DRA minister of mines and industry, and held a warm, friendly conversation with him on questions of the state of and prospects for developing Soviet-Afghan economic and technical cooperation.

H. Mangal, DRA ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

AFGHAN PDPA SECRETARY PRAISES SOVIET SUPPORT

PM100951 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Egyptian Journalists on Afghanistan"]

[Text] Cairo, 7 Feb -- The newspaper AL-AHALI has published an article by Egyptian journalists who recently visited Afghanistan. It says, in particular:

The limited contingent of Soviet troops was sent to Afghanistan at the request of the DRA Government and in accordance with the Treaty of Friendship, Goodneighborliness, and Cooperation between the DRA and the USSR. This measure is entirely in line with the UN Charter, accords with the spirit of traditional friendship linking the Afghan and Soviet peoples, and is aimed at defending the gains of the April Revolution from outside encroachment. The DRA Government has repeatedly stated that the presence of the limited Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan is temporary. These forces will return to the USSR under an agreement with the DRA after the armed interference in its internal affairs stops and guarantees are given that it will not be resumed.

"The USSR's help in the struggle against the imperialist forces headed by the United States is vitally important for us and was given on a legitimate basis," the Egyptian journalists were told by M. Baryalay, candidate member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the PDPA Central Committee. "Meanwhile, the forces of imperialism and reaction will have to answer the question about why they are interfering in our country's internal affairs."

"According to UN statistics, until recently Afghanistan was one of the least developed places in the world," S.M. Zaray, member of the PDPA Central Committee Politbuto and secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, stressed. "In those days not a single imperialist state showed a readiness to give us help. Now that we are able to choose our own friends, the imperialists are expressing 'extreme concern' about a 'restriction of sovereignty and religion' in Afghanistan.

"The United States, Pakistan, Iran, China, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt," S.M. Zaray continued, "make no secret of their support for the Afghan counterrevolution. They arm and finance groups that are terrorizing the Afghan people and killing, stealing, and burning on DRA soil. According to former Egyptian President al-Sadat's statements, the United States bought Soviet-made weapons from Egypt and passed them on to their Afghan counterrevolutionary hirelings. People try to claim that these weapons have been 'captured from Soviet and Afghan soldiers.'"

In unleashing the undeclared war against the DRA, U.S. imperialism is trying to exhaust the country's resources and cut the ground from under the revolutionary authorities. However, the U.S. gamble on undermining and destabilizing the situation in Afghanistan has failed, the authors note.

FOREIGN JOURNALISTS BRIEFED DURING AFGHAN VISIT

PM101433 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Journalists' Trip"]

[Text] Kabul, 6 Feb -- A group of representatives of the mass media of the USSR, the GDR, the CSSR, Poland, the United States, Britain, the FRG, Japan, Sweden, India, Kuwait, and Finland were in Afghanistan from 20 through 27 January at the DRA Foreign Ministry's invitation. The visitors were acquainted with the republic's achievements in the political, economic, and cultural spheres in the period since the April Revolution and the social transformations which are being carried out in the broad working masses' interests despite the continuing undeclared war waged by imperialism and reaction against the Afghan people.

A number of press conferences were organized for the foreign journalists. Prominent DRA statesmen and party and public figures, including new nonparty members of the republic's government and Revolutionary Council answered their questions.

During meetings with DRA Government members the foreign journalists were given information about the development of the country's national economy. The journalists learned about the activity of state and private sector trade and the mass literacy campaign. Conversations stressed the important role played in various spheres by international aid to Afghanistan from the USSR and the other socialist countries.

During their visit, the journalists conversed with believers representing the working class and peasantry and members of local organs of power. Ordinary Afghans spoke with anger and outrage about the crimes of dushman gangs and the support given to the bandits by their imperialist protectors.

During a trip to Jalalabad, the foreign journalists met participants in the events in the Khyber Pass region, where the Islamabad regime has thrown many thousands of regular army troops against Afridi and Shinwari tribes. Authoritative representatives and leaders of these Pashto tribes expressed support for revolutionary Afghanistan and resolutely condemned the U.S. -backed Pakistani armed intervention in the free tribe's affairs and the goons' tyranny.

B. Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, spoke at the concluding press conference about the solidarity of the Afghan Government and people with the Pashto tribes' struggle and their readiness to give them all moral assistance. The foreign journalists received additional explanations on the question of the new government measures to broaden the social base of revolutionary power and on the settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan.

YELTSIN RECEIVES PZPR DELEGATION IN MOSCOW

PM101425 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 86 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Guests From Warsaw"]

[Text] A delegation of the Warsaw PZPR Committee headed by J. Kubasiewicz, first secretary of the Warsaw PZPR Committee, arrived in Moscow yesterday at the invitation of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. The delegation consists of M. Szostek, chairman of the Warsaw People's Council; Debicki, governor of Warsaw; and L. Glogowski, section chief at the Warsaw PZPR Committee.

On the same day the delegation was received at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom by B.N. Yeltsin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. Briefings were exchanged on progress in preparations by the two capitals' party organizations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress and the fulfillment of plans for the capitals' socioeconomic development. Questions concerning the strengthening of friendly ties between Moscow and Warsaw were discussed.

V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, V.G. Zakharov and L.N. Spiridonov, secretaries of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom; and W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS SOVIET-POLISH CONSULTATIONS

PM091938 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Soviet-Polish consultations were held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 7 February. They were attended by J. Kinast, Polish deputy minister of foreign affairs, and V.G. Komplektov and V.P. Loginov, USSR deputy foreign ministers. An exchange of views took place on questions of mutual interest. Present at the talks was W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR.

ALBANIAN TRADE ACCORDS WITH POLAND, CSSR CITED

PM061457 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Agreements Signed"]

[Text] Warsaw, 4 Feb -- An agreement on commodity exchange and payments for 1986-1990 and protocol on commodity exchange and payments for 1986 have been signed between Poland and Albania here, PAP reports.

In conformity with the document, Poland will supply Albania with mining equipment, vans, cars, and light industry products. The Albanian export list comprises bitumen, chrome ore, and consumer goods.

Prague, 4 Feb -- CTK reports that an agreement between the CSSR and Albania on commodity exchange and payments for 1986-1990 has been signed in Tirana.

The CSSR will export to Albania trucks, locomotives, railcars, machine tools, and consumer goods. Albania's exports to Czechoslovakia will include chrome ore, bitumen, tobacco goods, vegetables and fruit.

SOVIET AMBASSADOR TO SPAIN LEAVES POST

AU111025 Paris AFP in English 1015 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Madrid, Feb 11 (AFP) -- The Soviet ambassador to Spain, Yuriy Dubinin, has left his post and is to return to Moscow later this week, an embassy spokesman said here today.

He did not give any reason for Mr. Dubinin's departure. The 55-year-old ambassador had been in Madrid since October 1978.

ZAMYATIN VISITS FINLAND; MEETS WITH OFFICIALS

Received by Foreign Minister

LD071128 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Helsinki, February 7 TASS -- A meeting of members of antiwar, public and political organizations of Finland was held here. It was attended by MPs [Members of Parliament] representatives of leading political parties of the country, the organization "Peace Supporters of Finland", trade unions, youth organizations, the "Finland -- Soviet Union" society, and pressmen.

Leonid Zamyatin, head of the Department of International Information of the CPSU Central Committee, a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. delivered a report about the new Soviet peace initiatives destined to eliminate nuclear weapons and terminate the lethal arms race.

Paavo Vayrynen, minister of foreign affairs of Finland, chairman of the Center Party, received Leonid Zamyatin and had a conversation with him on questions relating to disarmament in the context of Soviet proposals set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his statement of January 15, 1986.

Prime Minister Meets Zamyatin

LD101458 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1001 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Helsinki, 10 Feb (TASS) -- Kalevi Sorsa, the prime minister of Finland and chairman of the country's Social Democratic Party today received Leonid Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department at the CPSU Central Committee who is here and had a conversation with him on several international issues.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA ON GORBACHEV INTERVIEW

Interviewer Comments

PM100947 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by Gerard Streiff, Moscow correspondent of L'HUMANITE and member of the French Communist Party Central Committee: "I am Proud To Have Been the First to Read the Interview"]

[Text] To be able to interview Comrade Gorbachev on questions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy, in my view, is a great opportunity, even from the professional viewpoint, and in addition it is evidence of the profound mutual respect in relations between the Soviet and French Communists.

From the political viewpoint this interview is of tremendous significance. There is a great deal that is new in it, both in form and in content. First, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee speaks about everything; there are no "taboo" questions for him. Second, his replies clearly reflect the changes that are currently taking place in the life of the entire country.

Which of Comrade Gorbachev's replies did we find most interesting? Virtually all of them. Our questions were direct, even pointed at times. And to all of them we received a specific and detailed answer without any "padding." In addition to the historical perspective, Comrade Gorbachev touched on issues of internal life, the economic reforms, for instance, which are currently being implemented in your country -- an important and interesting matter. He noted that specific difficulties and problems exist in this sphere which have to be confronted. To us, all the topics touched on in the interview seem extraordinarily important.

As for the replies to the questions concerning international politics, I was particularly impressed by Comrade Gorbachev's analysis of the U.S. Administration's course, and especially its stance on the "star wars" plans. He made a distinction between a small group of "enthusiasts" within the administration who believe in this venture, those who want to grow rich on it, and those who would like to use the opportunity to exhaust the USSR economically.

Now I would like to draw your attention to the following fact: When on the morning after the publication of the interview I listened to Moscow radio's First Program, the announcers read the text of Comrade Gorbachev's replies to our questions, while the French radio failed to even mention the interview. There was not a word! I learned about this on the same day after telephoning my family who live in Provence. A logical question arises: How is it possible that French radio fails to mention such an interview? The answer is simple. It is possible because everything that bears any relation to the Soviet Union is censored in France. Our bourgeoisie is afraid of socialism and the socialist countries. It is afraid because its own country, just like all other capitalist countries, is in a state of crisis. It is afraid lest socialism should become a realistic alternative to capitalism in people's minds. This is why in France either slander or attacks are forthcoming on the subject of the USSR or...a deathly silence.

Our interview is a case in point. As one of its authors I am perhaps being immodest but I consider this interview simply exceptional. It contains so much that is new, matters that are of interest to the French. After all, most of my compatriots are very interested in everything that concerns the Soviet Union, everything that happens there, and the interview with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee contains precisely the information they would like to have. However, the bourgeois authorities are afraid of this kind of information and are, by means of censorship, stopping the truth from getting through.

This, in my view, is the main reason why anti-Sovietism is rampant in France today; anti-Sovietism based on ignorance. All the newspapers -- with the exception of L'HUMANITE -- as well as the radio and television are constantly spreading false information about the Soviet Union. The U.S. press, for instance, claims that all the USSR's peace initiatives are a propaganda trick. The same is true of the French right-wing newspapers. At every opportunity they claim: "Propaganda, nothing but propaganda!" Take for instance M.S. Gorbachev's statement -- this sensational package of new positive initiatives whose implementation would make it possible to rid the world of nuclear weapons within 15 years. Yet the bourgeois press tried, at best, to underrate the significance of this peace program claiming: "It is, of course, a beautiful dream, but not more than that. It is unrealistic." At worst, the press did not mention the Soviet proposals at all, hushing them up, just like our interview.

I repeat, anti-Sovietism in France is based mainly on lack of knowledge about the Soviet Union. It is, for instance, widespread among French cultural figures. However, as soon as any one of them gets to know just something about Soviet culture or meets one of his Soviet colleagues, their impression of the USSR changes drastically.

The history of friendship between France and your country spans many decades. Between our states there are many points of contact and therefore it is not surprising that despite the efforts of the bourgeois press and censorship the desire to get to know more about the Soviet Union and to establish closer links nonetheless prevails among the French. Most of my compatriots believe that it is a good thing when Moscow and Paris are together; for Europe, and for the whole world.

'Anti-Sovietism' in France

PM101701 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 p 3

[Report by own correspondent K. Privalov. "A Moment of Truth"]

[Text] Paris, 8 Feb -- "L'HUMANITE doesn't need any publicity today," mail service employee Gerard (Ali) was sure of that. On Saturdays he generally stands with a bundle of copies of L'HUMANITE, still reeking of printer's ink, near the market outside Montparnasse Station. "Everyone wants to know what CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev said. It is the first time a leader of the Soviet State has granted the French Communists' newspaper an interview.

"CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev answered with great candor all the questions we put to him. They were the very questions that are currently on the lips of broad strata of the French public," L'HUMANITE political director Roland Leroy, member of the French Communist Party (PCF) Politburo told Soviet journalists. "Unfortunately, French people are currently being subjected to massive anti-Soviet indoctrination. For that very reason there is an acute need for authentic information about your country. Comrade Gorbachev answered frankly and with great optimism all our questions concerning the USSR's economic development and the role played by the CPSU. He also touched on vital problems of peace. He speaks with amazing precision and clarity about the need for disarmament and international detente. Analyzing the state of French-Soviet relations since his visit to Paris, he expressed bewilderment at the unjustified expulsion of four Soviet diplomats from France... To sum up, I want to emphasize once again that it was L'HUMANITE that printed the important interview with the Soviet leader.

Yes, the publication of the interview was keenly awaited here. Both our friends and our enemies in France were preparing for it. Everyone was perfectly well aware that an interview with M.S. Gorbachev in one of the country's main dailies is an important step toward the French people, who want a new interpretation of the world political atmosphere and want to "discover" for themselves the one-fifth [as published] of the globe known as the USSR. Some people acquired this knowledge in the Odessa roadstead, where the red flag of rebel Marseilles sailors was hoisted above the interventionists' squadron sent to put down the revolution. Some acquired it in the forests and mountains of France when it was fighting the Hitlerite aggressors, when men with unpronounceable Russian names began to appear in the Maquis partisan detachments. But for some the "discovery" of the Soviet Union began today -- with the interview.

"Ignorance of the realities of the Soviet way of life is not French people's fault but their misfortune," Claude (Sheyu), deputy mayor of the city of Corbeil-Essonnes, said. Comrade Gorbachev is calling for friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation. I am convinced that the majority of French people want constant and close contacts with the Soviet Union and detente. We all need peace, for the sake of our children's future."

The conversation took place in the foyer of the "Pablo Neruda" Center, one of the main attractions in Corbeil-Essonnes. The seventh children's movie festival is currently taking place in this splendid building. It is being attended by Soviet moviemakers and Soviet schoolchildren studying French. The movies alternate with meetings for the children with their contemporaries. During one of them a French boy, Alain, made the acquaintance of a young Muscovite, Vanya. They are both 11. What did the curly-haired boys talk about, what did they debate? The cartoons showing in France and the USSR, vacations at summer camps, their favorite dogs...Questions and answers that were naive and childlike in their simplicity. But they implied not only a mutual interest, but a burning desire to convert this attraction into a permanent, lasting friendship.

And all this despite attempts by certain forces in France to discredit French-Soviet relations at all costs.

"When I picked up a fourth-grade geography textbook I was amazed at the spirit of primitive anti-Sovietism that ran through it," Francoise Dufour of Manche wrote in her letter. "When I went to the school and angrily showed the book to the teacher, he made me feel ashamed: Apparently, there had been another book before, but it was considered too 'pro-Soviet,' allegedly produced with 'money from Moscow'...Later I learned that not long before a teacher who had made no secret of his Communist Party membership had been expelled from the school. He was accused of 'overpoliticizing' classes and dismissed. Great! Apparently what we have is not freedom, but a one-way street!"

Last week alone on several occasions French television turned its lavishly illuminated studios into veritable incubators for raising fat anti-Soviet "canards." All manner of "sensations" were sent soaring into the air! But the slanderers forget one important thing: You can fool some of the people some the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

"I was very pleased to hear CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev talking about Soviet youth and saying that young men and women in the USSR are loyal to the ideals of socialism and are actively involved in all spheres of the country's life." My interlocutor was Gilles (Per), a leader of the Paris branch of the French Communist Youth Movement. "In the West they are too fond of claiming that youth today is 'deideologized,' bereft of moral values... Comrade Gorbachev is right: Those who think this way are in fact indulging in wishful thinking. As the Soviet leader rightly said, facts are obstinate things. The tasks facing young people in the USSR cannot be compared with the problems young French people have to tackle every day. Can one believe in the ideals of bourgeois 'freedom' and 'democracy' when hundreds of thousands of young people in France alone do not even have unemployment benefits! The picture is completely different in the Soviet Union: 500,000 young people are working voluntarily and enthusiastically at shock construction sites in Siberia, the European North, and the Far East."

"...The world lives on grains of truth and large quantities of lies," Romain Rolland claimed. The wise Frenchman was probably right. But sometimes the mountains of lies cannot outweigh the priceless grains of truth. This happens -- alas! -- rarely. Indeed, the moment of truth is part of a sequence. It is the culmination of the whole course of history. And when its time comes, it becomes part of history itself. For France that hour has struck!

U.S., ISRAEL PREPARING OPERATION AGAINST LIBYA

LD110911 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] We have already reported the beginning of large-scale NATO maneuvers in the south of the Italian island of Sardinia. Observers draw attention to the fact that these military games are taking place in close proximity to the shores of Africa, at a time of aggravation of the situation in the Mediterranean region because of the provocative U.S. campaign against Libya. Apart from the fact that naval aircraft of the U.S. 6th Fleet have been ordered to make incursions into Libya's airspace, Washington has decided to secure a continual naval presence near the shores of that state. Our correspondent Leonid Rassadin reports from Cairo:

The existence of a secret program for U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation has become known in Arab capitals. It envisages a practice bombing strike on a special range in Israeli territory, in the Negev desert, by U.S. naval aircraft based in the Mediterranean Sea region: The landscape there precisely resembles the desert regions of Libya. In the view of Arab observers, all this bears witness to the continuing intensive U.S. preparations -- possibly jointly with Israel -- for an interventionist operation against sovereign Libya.

SYRIAN-SOVIET TALKS HELD ON ADVANCED MISSILES

LD041017 Kuwait KUNA in English 0849 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Kuwait, Feb 4 (KUNA) -- Daily AL-QABAS Tuesday [4 February] quoted well-informed sources in Damascus as saying that talks between high ranking Soviet-Syrian officials took place recently on providing Syria with advanced anti-aircraft SAM-5 missiles. The talks were held following reports that the SAM-5 missiles were not strong enough to confront the most advanced equipments provided to the U.S. aircraft the paper added. The sources told the paper that Israeli warplanes were equipped with a limited number of such equipments which help in avoiding long-range missiles. The daily pointed out that detailed reports were prepared by a number of Soviet experts who were monitoring Israeli warplanes' activities in Syria.

SYRIAN CP ISSUES PRE-ELECTION STATEMENT

PM101235 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the rubric "In the Fraternal Parties": "Syrian Communists' Stance"]

[Text] Damascus, 9 Feb -- On the eve of elections for the Syrian Arab Republic's supreme legislative body -- the People's Assembly -- the Syrian Communist Party [SCP] Central Committee has issued a statement devoted to this important event in the country's life.

The statement emphasizes that Syria takes a resolute stance of countering the plans of imperialism and Zionism, continues the struggle for the liberation of Arab territories occupied by Israel, rebuffs the attempts to impose defeatist deals on the Arabs, and advocates the implementation of Palestinian Arabs' legitimate aspirations for self-determination and the creation of an independent state. In this struggle it relies on the firm foundation of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union, which invariably supports the Syrian people politically and helps them to consolidate the national economic base.

The Syrian Arab Republic's principled foreign policy course, the document points out, generates an ardent response in the heart of every Syrian patriot. The SCP, in cooperation with all democratic and patriotic forces in the country, will continue to assist in consolidating the line chosen by Syria in the international arena and will continue to work on improving the democratic system, which is an important factor of success both in foreign policy and in satisfying society's economic and social needs, and in its advance along the progressive path.

The SCP Central Committee statement notes that great importance in this work is attached to the consolidation of the Syrian Progressive National Front, the enhancement of the latter's role and the role of every party belonging to it, the intensification of the Front's influence on the country's political, social, and economic life, and the expansion of cooperation within the framework at all levels and in various spheres.

ZAMYATIN DISCUSSES MIDEAST DEVELOPMENTS

HK110224 Hong Kong AFP in English 0155 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Beirut, Feb 11 (AFP) -- Soviet Central Committee member Leonid Zamyatin denied in an interview published here Tuesday that the Soviet Union will allow a large number of Jews to emigrate to Israel. He said statements by Israeli leaders about a likely restoration of diplomatic relations and about an impending "exodus" of Soviet Jews were "lies" to discredit Moscow in the eyes of Arab countries.

The Central Committee's world information chief also accused Israel and the United States of "doing everything they can to torpedo" the proposed international conference to end the Arab-Israeli conflict. Mr Zamyatin told the Lebanese newspaper AL-SAFIR that Washington wanted the conference to be limited to endorsing "a separate bargain between Israel and certain Arab states". The Palestine Liberation Organization would be excluded from that deal, which would only grant the Palestinian Arabs "limited administrative autonomy". He said civil warfare continues in Lebanon because of "unscrupulous meddling by partners of the American-Israeli alliance." Mr Zamyatin called the fighting between Marxist factions in South Yemen "tragic". But it was a "domestic problem that should be settled without any foreign intervention."

'ARAFAT MEETS SOVIET AMBASSADOR IN AMMAN

JN070949 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 7 Feb 86 p 20

[Text] Amman -- PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat met with the Soviet ambassador in Amman yesterday and discussed with him the latest developments in the Palestine question as well as the peace talks.

SOVIET ENVOY TO JORDAN ALSO GIVEN OMAN POST

PM091924 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Aleksandr Ivanovich Zinchuk, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, to act as the USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Sultanate of Oman also.

IZVESTIYA STAFFERS HIT U.S. SUPPORT FOR UNITA

PM041025 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Report on telephone linkup between Boris Pilyatskin, deputy editor of IZVESTIYA's Asia, Africa, and Latin America Department; own correspondent in Washington Aleksandr Palladin; and own correspondent in Luanda Sergey Nikonov: "Washington and Luanda Calling: The Open Secret War Against Angola" -- first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] "Patent Madness of Secret Interference" is how THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper headlined an article in which it cited the following words by President R. Reagan about supporting the terrorist organization the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA]: "We consider that a secret operation will prove more useful to us and has greater chances of being successful at the moment than the overt operation proposed in Congress." What can be covert, concealed, secret, or disguised, the newspaper reasonably asked last December, about a policy proclaimed by the commander in chief?

Now that Washington has laid out the red carpet for the terrorist and killer Savimbi, all the i's have been dotted, so to speak. The UNITA boss has crossed the Atlantic to muster even greater financial and military assistance from his American protectors, who use the UNITA gangs to wage war against Angola and undermine its sovereignty.

Editorial Office: Washington claims that Savimbi is there in a private capacity. What itinerary has been arranged for him in the United States?

Washington: The usual ploy and hypocrisy of officials here is to take refuge in "diffidence." Suffice it to day that Savimbi, whom the president describes as a "freedom fighter," no less, was granted an audience with Reagan at the White House on Thursday. Prior to that, the UNITA terrorist, who is being driven around in a Cadillac escorted by a large group of American bodyguards, was received by Secretary of State G. Shultz and Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger. The crowded U.S. itinerary also includes lunch at the Cuban American Association (center for the gusanos, who fled Cuba after the revolution), calls on members of the Senate and the House, and a reception at the Heritage Foundation, the Republicans' think tank, whose recommendations often become the Washington policy course. Incidentally, I was informed by "foundation" staffer (G.) Berkowitz that the reception guest list includes State Department chief Shultz, his assistant Crocker, and CIA Director Casey. I also spoke to a representative of Black, Manafort, Stone, Kelly Inc., which has been given the job of looking after the guest from the Angolan bush. Located in Alexandria, on the opposite side of the Potomac from the U.S. capital, the firm specializes in lobbying. It is closely connected with the Republican Party and made a sizable contribution to R. Reagan's reelection as president. It has become known here that the firm will receive $600,000 for "service rendered" to Savimbi. "Who is paying the bill?" I asked a firm employee. "The money is transferred to our account from private sources," he said drily, cutting short our conversation.

Editorial Office: On 11 November 1975 under the leadership of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola [MPLA] -- the vanguard of the Angolan people -- the People's Republic of Angola was proclaimed. It was proclaimed amid the fire and smoke of fierce fighting: South African regular troops crossed the Namibian-Angolan border and headed for the capital. At the same time UNITA together with the National Front for the Liberation of Angola [FNLA] stabbed the revolution in the back. The interventionists were repulsed, but aggression against Angola continues. The Angola press constantly carries reports about UNITA bandit actions. What, then, is the explanation for the fact that it has not yet been possible to eliminate the terrorist grouping, and what difficulties have to be overcome by the People's Armed Forces for the liberation of Angola in their struggle against it?

There are quite a few difficulties. First, the bandits usually set up their strongholds in sparsely populated and inaccessible areas or under cover of the South African Armed Forces. Second, after a raid the UNITA troops quickly leave the battlefield and slink off into the bush. The People's Armed Forces fighters, with their heavy weapons and equipment, are often physically incapable of pursuing the enemy into the bush and swamp. Finally -- and it is main point -- you should not forget the growing aid that Pretoria and Washington are giving UNITA.

Editorial Office: We already know about the financial aid. But how is the military aid given?

Luanda: South African instructors train UNITA troops at their bases in Namibia, from where they are dispatched into Angola equipped with the latest weapons, including weapons from NATO stores. If the bandits are running out of ammunition and food, they are quickly supplied with all they need by South African Air Force helicopters and transport planes.

Editorial Office: Could you give some examples to illustrate this?

Luanda: Last September, when a real danger developed that the UNITA main forces in Cuando Cubango Province would be destroyed, South African troops immediately intervened and attacked People's Armed Forces subunits. In that operation, as in others, South Africa used its air force and a special mercenary battalion.

Editorial Office: It turns out that from a military standpoint UNITA is effectively part of the South African armed forces.

Luanda: That firm opinion held by our Angolan comrades is based on numerous facts. UNITA and South Africa have repeatedly carried out joint operations against the People's Armed Forces. That happened in Cunene Province. The racists use the UNITA troops to carry out joint acts of sabotage -- blowing up power stations, fuel stores, bridges, and so forth.

Editorial Office: It is claimed in the West that a large part of Angola is under the control of the counterrevolutionary gangs...

Luanda: The republic covers more than 1.2 million square km, that is to say, an area almost equivalent to the territory of Portugal, Spain, France, and Britain taken together. According to those same Western propaganda figures, Savimbi has around 35,000 men "under arms." It thus turns out that there 0.03 bandits per square kilometer. I think that given such "forces" it is scarely possible even theoretically to control a large part of Angolan territory. Today the largest UNITA gangs are stationed in the south of the country, near the Namibian border, under the umbrella of South African Armed Forces.

Editorial Office: And what can be said about UNITA's political program?

Luanda: Savimbi himself says that he favors creating a "national unity government" and a so-called "black, independent Angola." In reality his entire program consists in imposing terror and eliminating the Angolan people's revolutionary gains, so as to turn the country into a puppet for the West and South Africa. As for the ordinary members of UNITA, I have frequently spoken to prisoners. Most of them are illiterate, frightened peasants enlisted into Savimbi's army by threats or force. Mostly they know nothing about the real situation in the country and the kind of tasks that the Angolan people are tackling. They are forbidden to listen to Luanda Radio on pain of death. For possession of a pamphlet or the JORNAL DE ANGOLA they are shot on the spot. It is only by violence and terror that the UNITA bosses are managing to replenish their battle-thinned ranks.

Editorial Office: How does the Angolan public see Savimbi's visit to Washington?

Luanda: I have a recent issue of the JORNAL DE ANGOLA with me. Its front page carries an article which describes it as an act of direct provocative intervention by the White House in sovereign Angola's internal affairs. And that is how the whole progressive Africa also sees Washington's venture.

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION VISITS SIERRA LEONE

Mukashev Attends Parade

PM291055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Military Parade"]

[Text] Freetown, 25 Jan -- A military parade has been held here in the context of measures connected with the inauguration of Joseph Saidu Momoh as president of Sierra Leone. The ceremony was attended by foreign guests. They included a USSR delegation headed by S. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Visit Ends

PM311321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] Freetown, 29 Jan -- The visit to Sierra Leone by a USSR delegation headed by S. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has ended. It attended events connected with the inauguration of Joseph Saidu Momoh as president of Sierra Leone.

During the visit the delegation was received by the head of state and had meetings with Sierra Leone's foreign minister, parliamentarians, and representatives of the public.